Philoshopy Presfective:

The Reason at Six Structure Sosiological And Dualism.

Writer

A. W. Al-faiz.

Table of Contents.

DISCOURSE PENGANTAR: THE REASON AT SIX STRUCTURE SOCIOLOGICAL AND DUALISM. 8

Introduction to Philosophical Problems. 8

Epistemological background..... 8

Problematizing Dualism in a Sociological Context 9
Six Sociological Structures as a Challenge to Dualism 9
Investigative Methodology 10
Implications for Contemporary Philosophical Problems 11
Further Discourse Structure..... 11
Discourse ini akan unfold melalui systematic examination dari each of the six structures, menganalisis how they challenge dualistic assumptions dan what alternative conceptual frameworks they suggest. Each structure akan examined dalam its historical development, contemporary manifestations, dan implications untuk philosophical understanding dari relationship antara individual dan society, subject dan object, mental dan material. 11
Framework of Thought in Philosophical Problem Lema. 11
1. Problem Interaksi Substansi (Mind-Body Interaction Problem). 11
2. Identity and Continuity Problems. 12
3. Mental Causality Problem. 12
4. Spatial Localization Problem. 12
5. Emergency and Reduction Problems. 12
6. The Problem of Epistemological Consistency. 12
CHAPTER 1. 13
CHAPTER 1: MIND-BODY INTERACTION PROBLEM. 13
Definition and Meaning. 13
Terminological Context..... 13
Etymological Analysis. 14
Historical Context and Theoretical Development. 14
Theoretical Dimensions and Philosophical Implications. 15
Examples of Concrete Cases and Applications. 15
Conceptual Challenges and Paradoxes. 16
THE PROBLEM OF IDENTITY AND SELF-CONTINUITY IN A DUALISTIC SOCIOLOGICAL NETWORK. 17
Personal Identity as a Socio-Ontological Construction. 17
Contextualization in Sociological Network Systems. 17
Constellative Sense in the Movement of Social Space Confrontation. 18
Systemic Dynamics in the Formation of Collective Identity. 18

Mens Rea as a Social Principle in Ontological Dualism. 19
The Mechanism of Collective Entities in the Assumption of Similarity of Rationality Relations. 19
Classes of Workers' Societies and Collective Identities. 20
Gradual Changes in Personality and Collective Memory. 20
Synthesis: Identity as a Socio-Ontological Praxis. 21
CHAPTER 2. 21
CHAPTER 2: ECONOMIC STRUCTURE AND CHALLENGES TO PHILOSOPHICAL DUALISM. 21
2.1 Introduction: Economics as an Ontological Field. 21
2.2 Mode of Production as Social Totality 22
2.2.1 Criticism of Classical Political Economy. 22
2.2.2 Forces of Production dan Relations of Production. 23
2.2.3 Dialectics of Subjects and Objects in the Work Process. 23
2.3 Commodity Fetishism: Inversion of Subject and Object. 23
2.3.1 Mystical Character of Commodities 23
2.3.2 Reification and False Consciousness. 24
2.3.3 Criticism of the Dualism of Consciousness-Being 24
2.4 Real Values and Abstractions. 25
2.4.1 Labor Theory of Value dan Social Abstraction. 25
2.4.2 Dialectics of Abstract dan Concrete. 25
2.4.3 Money as Universal Equivalent. 26
2.5 Alienation and Objectification. 26
2.5.1 Four Forms of Alienation 26
2.5.2 Objectification versus Alienation 26
2.5.3 Species-Being dan Individual-Universal Dialectic. 27
2.6 Ideology and Material Practice. 27
2.6.1 Ideology as a Material Force. 27
2.6.2 Hegemoni dan Consensus. 28
2.6.3 Contradictions dan Crisis 28
2.7 Contemporary Developments dan Implications. 28
2.7.1 Post-Fordism dan Immaterial Labor. 28

2.7.2 Financialization dan Virtual Economy 29
2.7.3 Digital Economy dan Platform Capitalism. 29
2.8 Conclusion: Towards Post-Dualistic Understanding. 29
CHAPTER 3 30
CHAPTER 3 : POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND DECONSTRUCTION OF POWER-AUTHORITY DUALISM 30
3.1 Introduction: Politics as an Arena of Material-Symbolic Interpenetration 30
3.2 Fundamental Terminology and Etymological Analysis. 31
3.2.1 Power versus Authority. 31
3.2.2 Legitimacy dan Legitimation 31
3.2.3 Hegemony (Hegemonie) dan Cultural Leadership 32
3.2.4 Symbolic violence. 32
3.3 Max Weber: The Typology of Authority and the Problem of Legitimacy. 33
3.3.1 Traditional Authority and Patrimonialism. 33
3.3.2 Charismatic Authority and Revolutionary Leadership. 34
3.3.3 Legal-Rational Authority and Modern Bureaucracy. 34
3.4 Antonio Gramsci: Hegemoni dan Integrasi Coercion-Consent. 35
3.4.1 State in Narrow and Broad Sense. 35
3.4.2 War of Position versus War of Movement 36
3.4.3 Organic Intellectuals dan Cultural Production 36
3.5 Pierre Bourdieu: Symbolic Violence dan Political Field. 37
3.5.1 Political Field sebagai Space of Competition 37
3.5.2 Symbolic Capital dan Political Representation. 37
3.5.3 State sebagai Monopoly of Symbolic Violence 38
3.6 Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge dan Disciplinary Mechanisms. 38
3.6.1 From Sovereign Power to Disciplinary Power. 38
3.6.2 Panopticon as a Diagram of Power. 39
3.6.3 Biopower dan Population Management 40
3.7 Case Study: Legitimacy in the Modern Political Context 41
3.7.1 The Case of the 1998 Indonesian Revolution: The Crisis of Authority Legitimacy 41

3.7.2 The Case of the 2016 United States Presidential Election: Populism and the Crisis of Representation. 42
3.7.3 Kasus Brexit: Sovereignty dan Democratic Legitimacy. 42
3.8 Implications for Contemporary Political Philosophy 43
3.8.1 Beyond Consent-Coercion Dichotomy 43
3.8.2 Crisis of Liberal Democratic Legitimacy. 44
3.8.3 New Forms of Political Subjectivity. 44
3.9 Conclusion: Towards Post-Dualistic Political Theory. 44
BAB 4. 45
CHAPTER 4 : CULTURAL STRUCTURE AND TRANSCENDENCE OF THE MEANING-MATTER DICHOTOMY 45
4.1 Introduction: Culture as an Irreducible Ontological Field. 45
4.2 Fundamental Terminology and Etymological Analysis. 46
4.2.1 Culture dan Cultivation: From Agriculture to Civilization. 46
4.2.2 Habitus: Embodied Dispositions dan Structured Structuring Structures 47
4.2.3 Cultural Capital: Symbolic Power dan Social Reproduction 47
4.2.4 Symbolic Violence: Misrecognition dan Legitimation. 48
4.2.5 Thick Description: Interpretive Density dan Cultural Analysis 49
4.3 Pierre Bourdieu: Cultural Capital dan Distinction. 49
4.3.1 Field Theory dan Cultural Production 49
4.3.2 Habitus dan Cultural Practices 50
4.3.3 Distinction dan Social Reproduction 50
4.3.4 Conversion Strategies dan Cultural Investment 51
4.4 Clifford Geertz: Culture sebagai Web of Meaning. 52
4.4.1 Interpretive Anthropology dan Symbolic Action. 52
4.4.2 Thick Description dan Interpretive Method 52
4.4.3 Symbols dan Symbolic Action 53
4.4.4 Cultural System dan Social System 53
4.5 Maurice Merleau-Ponty: Embodied Culture dan Perceptual Meaning. 54
4.5.1 Phenomenology of Perception dan Cultural Embodiment. 54
4.5.2 Gestural Meaning dan Expression 54
4.5.3 Style dan Cultural Expression 55

4.6 Raymond Williams: Culture sebagai Whole Way of Life 55
4.6.1 Cultural Materialism dan Lived Experience 55
4.6.2 Hegemony dan Counter-Hegemonic Culture 56
4.6.3 Cultural Production dan Institutions 56
4.7 Case Study: Cultural Dynamics in a Contemporary Context 57
4.7.1 The Case of the Indonesian Education System: Cultural Capital and Social Reproduction 57
4.7.2 The Case of the K-Pop Cultural Industry: Global Cultural Flows and Soft Power 58
4.7.3 The Case of Indonesian Islamic Fashion: Religious Culture and Market Economy 59
4.8 Contemporary Theoretical Developments 60
4.8.1 Digital Culture dan Virtual Embodiment 60
4.8.2 Postcolonial Cultural Theory 60
4.8.3 Environmental Cultural Studies 61
4.9 Implications for Contemporary Cultural Philosophy 61
4.9.1 Beyond Idealism-Materialism Dichotomy 61
4.9.2 Embodied Cultural Cognition 61
4.9.3 Cultural Democratization dan Digital Technologies 62
4.9.4 Intercultural Understanding dalam Global Context 62
4.10 Conclusion: Towards Post-Dualistic Cultural Theory 62
CHAPTER 5. 64
CHAPTER 5: TEMPORAL STRUCTURE: TOWARDS AN INTEGRATIVE UNDERSTANDING OF TIME, MEMORY, AND SOCIAL ACTION. 64
And socio-ideological possibility: "God must be playing dice" - a treatise on efforts to reconstruct the sociological dimension to the clarification of confrontational conflicts. 64
Etymology and Terminological Context 65
Duration: Time as a Vital Stream 65
Social Frameworks of Memory: Memory as a Collective Construction 65
Structuration Theory: Integration of Temporal Dimensions 66
Substantive Context and Conceptual Priorities 66
Criticism of Temporal Reductionism 66

Integration of Subjectivity and Objectivity 67
Case Example: Temporal Conflict in Contemporary Society 67
Case 1: Generational Conflict in the Digital Age 67
Case 2: Post-Conflict Reconciliation and the Politics of Memory 67
Case 3: Globalization and Temporal Dislocation 68
Ideological Implications: "God Must Be Playing Dice" 68
CHAPTER 6. 69
CHAPTER 6: SPATIAL STRUCTURE: SPATIAL PRODUCTION, POWER GEOGRAPHY, AND SPATIO-TEMPORAL DIALECTICS IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL FORMATIONS. 69
Etymology and Terminological Context 70
Production of Space: Space as a Social Product 70
Disciplinary Mechanisms: Space as a Technology of Power 71
Spatial Fix: The Geographization of Capital Contradictions 71
Substantive Context and Conceptual Priorities 72
Criticism of Spatial Absolutism 72
Dialectic Spasio-Temporal 73
The Politicization of Spatiality 73
Case Example: Spatial Contestation in Contemporary Social Formations 73
Kasus 1: Gentrification dan Right to the City 73
Kasus 2: Smart City dan Surveillance Urbanism 74
Case 3: Extractive Industries and Environmental Injustice 75
Ideological Implications: Spatial Contestation and Sociological Reconstruction .. 76
Space as an Ideological Arena 76
Reconstruction of the Sociological Dimension 76
Clarification of Confrontational Conflict 76
Emansipatory Spatial Practices 77
BIBLIOGRAPHY 78
Primary Sources of Philosophy 78
Sociological Primary Sources 78
Secondary Sources and Contemporary Studies 80
CONCEPTUAL INDEX 81
A 81

B..... 81
C 81
D 81
And..... 81
F..... 81
G 81
H 82
I..... 82
L..... 82
M..... 82
Or 82
P..... 82
R..... 82
S..... 83
T 83
In the 83
V..... 83
In..... 83

DISCOURSE PENGANTAR: THE REASON AT SIX STRUCTURE SOCIOLOGICAL AND DUALISM.

Introduction to Philosophical Problems.

Epistemological background.

The confluence between the philosophical tradition of dualism and sociological structural analysis presents a theoretical complexity that challenges conventional understandings of social and individual reality. When René Descartes

formulated the dualism of substance in the 17th century, he did not anticipate that the mind-body dichotomy would face the serious challenge of the development of structural sociology that uncovers the collective dimensions of the formation of consciousness and identity.

This discourse departs from the premise that human reason does not operate in an ontological vacuum, but is manifested through six fundamental sociological structures that create productive tensions with dualistic assumptions. These structures—which include economic, political, cultural, symbolic, temporal, and spatial structures—form a complex terrain in which philosophical dualism must confront social realities irreducible to the simple dichotomy between the mental and the material.

Problematizing Dualism in a Sociological Context

The dualistic tradition, which separates expressly between res cogitans and res extensa, faces a fundamental dilemma when confronted with social phenomena that demonstrate the interpenetration between the material dimension and the ideal. Max Weber shows how social action always involves a subjective dimension of meaning, but this meaning can only be understood in an intersubjective context involving an objective social structure.

Émile Durkheim uncovered the sui generis reality of social fact that cannot be reduced to individual consciousness, but also cannot be fully explained within a mechanical materialistic framework. Pierre Bourdieu shows how habitus overcomes the object-subjective dichotomy through the concepts of "objectified subjectivity" and "subjectivized objectivity."

Karl Marx developed a critique of idealism and vulgar materialism through the concept of praxis that integrates thinking and being in transformative activity. Jürgen Habermas proposed communicative rationality as a medium for the formation of intersubjectivity that goes beyond subject-object dualism.

Six Sociological Structures as a Challenge to Dualism

1. Economic Structure Economic structure reveals how material production cannot be separated from symbolic reproduction. Karl Marx pointed out that the mode of production involves not only a technical relationship with nature, but also a relations of production that involves consciousness and ideology. Commodity fetishism reveals how social relations appear as relations between objects, challenging the simple dichotomy between material and ideal.

2. Political Structure Max Weber analyzes political legitimacy as a phenomenon involving both power and authority—material coercion and symbolic consent. The modern state shows how the monopoly of physical violence cannot be maintained without a monopoly of symbolic violence. Antonio Gramsci developed the concept of hegemony that integrated material dominance and cultural consensus.

3. Cultural Structure Pierre Bourdieu reveals how cultural capital operates as a form of power that is both symbolic and material. Cultural distinctions are not only a matter of taste, but also a mechanism of social reproduction that involves embodiment in habitus. Clifford Geertz shows how culture as a web of meaning whose thick description requires an interpretation that goes beyond the explanation-understanding dichotomy.

4. Symbolic Structure Ernst Cassirer analyzes humans as animal symbolicum whose reality is always mediated by symbolic forms. Claude Lévi-Strauss uncovered the unconscious structures that underlie the variation of cultural manifestations. Jacques Lacan shows how symbolic order constitutes subjectivity through language that is both material (signifier) and ideal (signified).

5. Temporal Structure Henri Bergson criticizes the spatialization of time in dualistic thought and proposes durée as a temporal flow that is irreducible to the mind-matter dichotomy. Maurice Halbwachs analyzes social frameworks of memory that show how individual temporality is always embedded in collective temporality. Anthony Giddens developed structuration theory that integrates diachronic and synchronic dimensions.

6. Spatial Structure Henri Lefebvre analyzes the production of space as a process involving spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces. Michel Foucault reveals how space and knowledge constitute each other in disciplinary mechanisms. David Harvey shows how spatial fixes in capitalization overcome contradictions through geographical expansion and temporal displacement.

Investigative Methodology

The investigation of these six structures requires a methodological approach that can overcome the limitations of both rationalist deduction and empiricist induction. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel proposed a dialectical method that could capture contradictions and their resolution in higher synthesis. Karl Marx transformed Hegelian dialectics through materialist inversion that still maintained dialectical logic.

Max Weber developed verstehende soziologie that integrates causal explanation and interpretive understanding through ideal types and adequate causation.

Émile Durkheim proposed a sociological method that treats social facts as things but recognizes their meaningful character. Pierre Bourdieu integrates objectivist and subjectivist approaches through reflexive sociology.

Implications for Contemporary Philosophical Problems

Analysis of six sociological structures reveals the inadequacy of traditional dualistic frameworks in capturing the complexity of contemporary social reality. Globalization, digitalization, and ecological crises require new conceptual frameworks that can integrate multiple levels and dimensions without falling into reductionism.

Contemporary philosophy of mind, from functionalism to embodied cognition, shows a movement beyond simple mind-body dualism. Contemporary social ontology, from John Searle to Margaret Gilbert, developed concepts of collective intentionality that challenged individualistic assumptions. Critical theory, from the Frankfurt School to postcolonial studies, reveals how power relations are embedded in apparently neutral conceptual distinctions.

Further Discourse Structure

Discourse ini akan unfold melalui systematic examination dari each of the six structures, menganalisis how they challenge dualistic assumptions dan what alternative conceptual frameworks they suggest. Each structure akan examined dalam its historical development, contemporary manifestations, dan implications untuk philosophical understanding dari relationship antara individual dan society, subject dan object, mental dan material.

Analysis akan proceed melalui dialectical engagement antara philosophical concepts dan sociological insights, seeking neither to dissolve philosophy into sociology nor sociology into philosophy, tetapi to develop integrated approach yang can do justice kepada complexity dari social reality tanpa abandoning philosophical rigor.

Framework of Thought in Philosophical Problem Lema.

1. Problem Interaksi Substansi (Mind-Body Interaction Problem).

How can two fundamentally different substances (mental and physical) interact with each other? If the mind is non-material and the body is material, what

mechanism allows the two to influence each other? This is a classic critique of Cartesian dualism.

2. Identity and Continuity Problems.

In a dualistic framework, what guarantees the continuity of personal identity over time? Does identity lie in mental, physical, or a combination of both? How to explain the gradual changes in personality and memory?

3. Mental Causality Problem.

If reality is made up of two different domains, how to explain the causal effectiveness of the mental domain over the physical domain? Does the mind really have causal powers or is it just an epiphenomenon of physical processes?

4. Spatial Localization Problem.

Where is mental substance "located" in physical space? If the mind has no spatial extension, how can it interact with a brain that has a specific location? This raises a paradox about spatial-non-spatial relationships.

5. Emergency and Reduction Problems.

How do mental phenomena "arise" from or relate to complex neural processes? Can mental traits be reduced to physical traits, or do they require irreducible explanations?

6. The Problem of Epistemological Consistency.

How can we acquire valid knowledge of both domains of reality (mental and physical) if they have different ontological properties? Are different epistemological methods needed for each domain, and how to ensure coherence between them?

These questions remain a major theoretical challenge in contemporary philosophy of thought and influenced the development of alternatives such as materialism, idealism, and neutral monism.

CHAPTER 1.

CHAPTER 1: MIND-BODY INTERACTION PROBLEM.

Definition and Meaning.

The Mind-Body Interaction Problem is one of the most fundamental philosophical problems in the Western tradition of thought that questions how two ontologically distinct entities—mind and body—can interact with each other and influence each other. This problem arises as a logical consequence of the adoption of a dualistic view of substance that separates reality into two categorically distinct domains.

In a broader context, this problem not only questions the mechanisms of interaction, but also challenges basic assumptions about the nature of reality itself. If the mind and body are really substantially different, then how can they form a coherent unity in everyday human experience? This question challenges our intuition about the oneness of the self and subjective experiences that seem to be integrated with the physical world.

Terminological Context.

Terminologically, "substance" in this context refers to a metaphysical concept that refers to an entity that has an independent existence and is the subject of various attributes or properties. In the philosophical tradition, substance is understood as something that exists in itself (in se) and does not depend on anything else for its existence, in contrast to attributes or modes that depend on substance.

"Interaction" in this context refers to a reciprocal causal relationship in which one entity can influence and be influenced by another entity. However, in a dualistic framework, this interaction becomes problematic because it involves two types of substances that have mutually exclusive properties. The mind, which is non-material, non-extensive, and indivisible, must interact with a body that is material, extensive, and mechanically divisible.

This problem is also closely related to the concept of causality. In the traditional understanding, causal relationships require the existence of a certain contact or mediation between cause and effect. However, how non-material substances can "touch" or affect material substances becomes a difficult puzzle to solve in a dualistic conceptual framework.

Etymological Analysis.

Etymologically, the word "substance" comes from the Latin "substantia," which is a translation of the Greek term "ousia" used by Aristotle. "Sub-stantia" literally means "that which stands below" (sub = below, stare = stand), indicating something that serves as a foundation or support for apparent attributes. This concept was later developed in the scholastic tradition and reached a sharper formulation in Cartesian thought.

"Interaction" comes from the Latin words "inter" (between) and "agere" (act), which denotes a reciprocal action between two or more entities. In a philosophical context, the term implies not only a one-way relationship, but a mutual influence that involves both parties as agents and patients simultaneously.

The term "mind" in English comes from the Anglo-Saxon word "gemynd" which is related to memory and consciousness, while "body" comes from "bodig" which refers to physical structure. This terminological dichotomy in itself has shaped the way we understand and categorize human experience in two separate domains.

Historical Context and Theoretical Development.

The problem of substance interaction reached its classical formulation in the philosophical system of René Descartes (1596-1650), who developed the dualism of substance in response to the challenges of skepticism and the scientific mechanisms that developed in his time. Descartes argued that reality consists of two different substances: res extensa (extensive substance/matter) which has the main attribute of extension in space, and res cogitans (substance of thought/mind) which has the main attribute of thought and consciousness.

However, as soon as Descartes formulated his position, critics such as Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia asked a fundamental question: how can a substance that has no extension (the mind) move a substance that does have an extension (the body)? This question exposed fundamental weaknesses in the Cartesian system and sparked a debate that continues to this day.

Descartes himself tried to solve this problem by proposing that interactions occur through the pineal gland (pinealis glandula) in the brain, which he considered to be the "seat of the soul." However, this solution is unsatisfactory because it only moves the problem to a more specific level without explaining the fundamental mechanisms of interaction between the material and the non-material.

Theoretical Dimensions and Philosophical Implications.

The problem of substance interaction has far-reaching implications for various philosophical areas. In epistemology, this problem has to do with the question of how knowledge of the external world can be acquired through sensory experience if the mind and body are substantially separated. In ethics, this problem concerns the question of moral responsibility and freedom of will—how can moral action be possible if there is no effective interaction between the mind (as the source of moral intentions) and the body (as the executor of actions)?

In religious philosophy, this problem is related to the question of the soul and its relationship to the body, as well as the possible survival of the soul after the death of the body. If the soul is completely different from the body, then logically the soul can survive without a body, but how can a soul without a body have a meaningful experience or identity?

Examples of Concrete Cases and Applications.

To understand the complexity of this problem, consider a simple case such as the decision to raise a hand. In everyday experience, there seems to be a clear continuity: we have the mental intention to raise our hands, and then our hands are actually raised. However, in a dualistic framework, this process becomes very problematic.

Mental intentions, as states or events in the substance of thought (res cogitans), must somehow cause physical changes in the nervous and muscular systems (res extensa). However, how can something that has no mass, energy, or spatial location produce causal effects in physical systems that follow mechanical laws? This goes against the principles of energy conservation and the law of physical causality.

Another interesting case is the experience of pain. When we experience physical injury, there seems to be a clear causal relationship between tissue damage (physical event) and the sensation of pain (mental event). However, how can physical changes in a network be "translated" into subjective experiences that have certain phenomenological qualities? And conversely, how can mental experiences affect the physical healing process, as is often observed in the placebo effect?

A more complex example can be found in the case of psychosomatic disorders, where a mental condition (such as stress or depression) appears to be causing noticeable physical symptoms. In a strict dualistic framework, this kind of causal relationship is difficult to explain without compromising the ontological independence of the two substances.

Conceptual Challenges and Paradoxes.

The problem of substance interaction produces some fundamental conceptual paradoxes. First, the paradox of causality: if causality requires physical contact or mediation, then non-physical substances cannot be effective causes in the physical world. However, if a mental substance can cause physical changes, then it must have some physical properties, which is contrary to its definition as a non-physical substance.

Second, the paradox of localization: the interaction seems to require that the two substances "meet" somewhere. However, mental substances, by definition, have no spatial location. How can something that doesn't have a location interact with something that has a specific location?

Third, the paradox of energy: if the mind can affect the body, then it seems to have to contribute energy to the physical system. However, where does this energy come from if the mind is non-physical? And how can this be compatible with energy conservation laws?

The problem of substance interaction remains one of the most significant theoretical challenges in contemporary philosophy of thought, influencing the development of various alternative positions such as eliminative materialism, functionalism, and identity theory, each of which attempts to address the difficulties faced by classical substance dualism.

THE PROBLEM OF IDENTITY AND SELF-CONTINUITY IN A DUALISTIC SOCIOLOGICAL NETWORK.

Personal Identity as a Socio-Ontological Construction.

The problem of identity and continuity of the self in a dualistic framework cannot be adequately understood without considering the sociological dimension that surrounds it. Personal identity, which is philosophically debated between mental and physical substances, is actually manifested and constructed through a complex network of social relations. In this context, the question of identity continuity is not only a metaphysical problem of the individual, but also a structural problem involving class dynamics, production relations, and the formation of collective consciousness.

When we consider identity in a dualistic framework, we are confronted with a fundamental paradox: if identity lies in a mental substance separate from the material world, how can that identity be formed and maintained through social interactions that are essentially material? Conversely, if identity is solely a product of material and social conditions, how can we explain the subjective continuity that the individual experiences as a coherent internal experience?

Contextualization in Sociological Network Systems.

From a sociological perspective, personal identity is never an isolated entity, but is always formed in and through a network of historical and structural social relations. Pierre Bourdieu shows how identity is formed through habitus—a structured, structured disposition that is formed through accumulated social experience. In a dualistic framework, this habitus presents its own complexity: is the habitus an internal mental structure or an internalized pattern of material practice?

The sociological networks that shape identity operate through a variety of mechanisms: family institutions that form primary identities, educational systems that construct professional and class identities, mass media that create consumptive identities, and political institutions that shape civic identities. Each of these mechanisms involves a complex interaction between the material dimension (economic structure, physical institutions, social practices) and the symbolic dimension (values, norms, representation).

In the context of an industrial capitalist society, personal identities become increasingly fragmented through functional differentiation and role specialization. Individuals no longer have a coherent single identity, but rather experience a multiplicity of contextual identities: identities as workers, consumers,

citizens, family members, and so on. This fragmentation raises a fundamental question about self-continuity: what guarantees that these various identities are the identities of the "same person"?

Constellative Sense in the Movement of Social Space Confrontation.

The concept of "constellative sense" refers to the ability of individuals to integrate a variety of heterogeneous social experiences and positions into a coherent narrative of identity. In a dualistic framework, this constellative sense presents its own challenge: does this integration occur at the level of mental substance (as a synthesis of consciousness) or is it an effect of the coordination of material social practices?

Confrontational movements in social spaces—whether in the form of class conflicts, social movements, or cultural resistance—are crucial moments in the formation and transformation of identity. When individuals participate in social movements, they not only express an existing identity, but also form a new identity through collective praxis. Georg Lukács shows how class consciousness is formed through collective struggle, rather than as a passive reflection of material conditions.

In this context, social space is not a neutral container in which identities operate, but rather a battlefield where various identities compete, negotiate, and transform with each other. Pierre Bourdieu conceptualized social space as a differentiating structure defined by the distribution of economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital. The position of the individual in the social space determines the possibilities of available identities while limiting the identities that can be lived.

Systemic Dynamics in the Formation of Collective Identity.

Systemic dynamics in identity formation involve complex interactions between the micro level (individual experience), meso (groups and institutions), and macro (broad social structures). In a dualistic framework, each of these levels presents specific problems:

At the micro level, the question is how individual subjective experiences can maintain continuity in the context of constant social change. Is this continuity guaranteed by a stable mental substance, or is it a narrative construct that is constantly reproduced through social practice?

At the meso level, the problem is how groups and institutions can form coherent collective identities of individuals who have different subjective experiences. Émile Durkheim shows how social solidarity can be formed even if individuals have

different consciousnesses, but in a dualistic framework, the mechanism of this solidarity formation becomes problematic.

At the macro level, the question is how broad social structures can influence the formation of individual identities without eliminating individual agency and subjectivity. Karl Marx showed how material conditions determine consciousness, but also recognized the human ability to change those conditions through praxis.

Mens Rea as a Social Principle in Ontological Dualism.

The concept of mens rea, which literally means "guilty thought," in a legal context refers to the intention or awareness in committing a punishable act. However, in a broader sociological context, mens rea can be understood as a social principle that recognizes the mental/intentional dimension of a social action, while integrating it with the material consequences of the action.

In a dualistic framework, mens rea presents a paradox: how can the legal and social systems hold individuals accountable for their actions if there is a fundamental separation between (mental) and (physical) intentions? This paradox becomes more complex when we consider that judgments about mens rea always involve collective social interpretations.

Max Weber shows how social action always involves a subjective dimension of meaning (Sinn), but this meaning can only be understood in an intersubjective context. In a dualistic framework, this raises the question: is subjective meaning a property of the individual's mental substance, or is it an internalized social construct?

The Mechanism of Collective Entities in the Assumption of Similarity of Rationality Relations.

The formation of collective entities—whether in the form of social classes, communities, or social movements—involves the assumption of a common rationality among its members. In a dualistic framework, this assumption presents its own complexity: how can individuals with separate mental substances develop the same or compatible rationality?

Jürgen Habermas proposed the concept of communicative rationality as a mechanism for the formation of intersubjective consensus. However, in a dualistic framework, this mechanism faces the problem of substance interaction: how can separate mental substances communicate and achieve common understanding?

Émile Durkheim tried to overcome this problem through the concept of collective consciousness which has a sui generis reality, separate from individual consciousness. However, this concept presents a new problem: how can collective consciousness affect individual consciousness if there is a fundamental separation between the collective and the individual?

Classes of Workers' Societies and Collective Identities.

In the context of capitalist society, the formation of working-class identity presents an interesting case to be analyzed in a dualistic framework. Karl Marx shows how the working class is formed not only through objective positions in the relations of production (Klasse an sich), but also through subjective awareness of those positions (Klasse für sich).

The transformation from an an sich class to a für sich class involves a complex process that includes the material dimension (working conditions, wages, production relations) and the ideal dimension (ideology, consciousness, solidarity). In a dualistic framework, this process presents a fundamental question: how can material conditions determine consciousness if there is an ontological separation between the material and the mental?

Georg Lukács tried to address this problem through the concept of reification and possible class consciousness (zugerechnetes Bewusstsein). According to him, class consciousness is not a direct reflection of material conditions, but rather a possible consciousness that can be achieved by a particular class in a certain historical situation. However, this concept still faces a dualistic problem: how can consciousness possibly be realized if there is no clear mechanism of interaction between material conditions and consciousness?

Gradual Changes in Personality and Collective Memory.

The problem of gradual changes in personality and memory acquires a new dimension when considered in a sociological context. Individuals not only experience internal changes, but also respond to changes in social structures, cultural norms, and material conditions of life.

Maurice Halbwachs shows how individual memory is always shaped by the social framework of memory (cadres sociaux de la mémoire). In a dualistic framework, this raises the question: is memory a property of the individual's mental substance that is then influenced by social factors, or is memory essentially a social construct internalized by the individual?

Gradual changes in personality are also related to changes in the social position of individuals. Pierre Bourdieu shows how habitus can change through new social experiences, but these changes occur gradually and sometimes conflictually. In a dualistic framework, this mechanism of habitus change becomes problematic: does change occur at the level of mental substance, material practice, or both?

Synthesis: Identity as a Socio-Ontological Praxis.

Analysis of identity and self-continuity problems in a sociological context shows the limitations of the dualistic framework in understanding the complexity of identity formation. Identity cannot be understood solely as a property of mental substance or as an effect of material conditions, but rather as a socio-ontological praxis that involves the dialectical interaction between subjectivity and objectivity, individuality and collectivity, continuity and change.

In this context, the continuity of identity is not guaranteed by a stable substance, but rather is reproduced through sustainable social practices. Identity is an achievement that must be continuously realized through actions, narratives, and social recognition. Changes in identity are not threats to continuity, but rather conditions for the reproduction of identity in dynamic social contexts.

The dualistic problem of understanding identity shows the need for a paradigm that can integrate the individual and social dimensions, subjective and objective, without reducing one dimension to another. This opens up space for the development of a social ontology that can overcome the limitations of substance dualism in understanding the complexity of human identity in historical and structural social contexts.

CHAPTER 2.

CHAPTER 2: ECONOMIC STRUCTURE AND CHALLENGES TO PHILOSOPHICAL DUALISM.

2.1 Introduction: Economics as an Ontological Field.

The economic structure of human society presents a theoretical complexity that challenges the fundamental assumptions of Cartesian dualism. When

René Descartes formulated a firm separation between res extensa (material substance) and res cogitans (substance of thought), he did not anticipate that human economic activity would reveal a profound interpenetration between the material and ideal dimensions in the constitution of social reality.

Karl Marx, through his analysis of the capitalist mode of production, showed that material production is never a purely technical or mechanical activity, but rather always involves complex symbolic, ideological and conscious dimensions. Commodity fetishism reveals how social relations between humans appear in a distorted form as relations between objects, creating an incomprehensible reality through a simple dichotomy between the material and the mental.

Economic structure thus becomes a theoretical laboratory that reveals the limitations of the dualistic framework in understanding complex social realities. This chapter will explore how Marx's analysis of capitalist economics yielded insights that went beyond and challenged traditional philosophical dualism.

2.2 Mode of Production as Social Totality

2.2.1 Criticism of Classical Political Economy.

Marx began his critique of classical political economy by pointing out that economists such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo had reified economic categories by treating them as eternal and universal laws of nature. This approach assumes a rigid separation between an "objective" economic base and a "subjective" ideological superstructure, a dichotomy that reflects a more fundamental philosophical dualism.

In *Grundrisse*, Marx points out that production is never an activity isolated from consumption, distribution, and exchange. These four moments form an organic totality where each moment contains and presupposes the other. Production not only produces objects for subjects, but also produces subjects for objects—creating specific needs, capacities, and forms of consciousness.

"Production produces consumption by creating materials for consumption; but consumption also produces production by creating the need for new products as the decisive goal of production" (*Grundrisse*, p. 25). This dialectical relationship reveals that economics cannot be understood through linear causal models, in which the base material mechanically determines the ideal superstructure.

2.2.2 Forces of Production dan Relations of Production.

Marx distinguished between productive forces (labor, means of production, technical knowledge) and relations of production (property relations, class relations, forms of cooperation). However, this distinction should not be understood in a dualistic framework that separates the "technical" from the "social," or the "material" from the "ideal."

Productive forces have always been social—they are formed through accumulated social knowledge and embodied in specific forms of cooperation. On the contrary, relations of production are not merely "ideal" or "legal", but materialized in concrete institutions, practices, and forms of social organization.

Technology, for example, is never a neutral tool, but is always embedded with specific social relations and forms of consciousness. The machines in the capitalist factory system not only increase productivity, but also organize workers in specific ways, creating particular forms of discipline, coordination, and alienation.

2.2.3 Dialectics of Subjects and Objects in the Work Process.

In his analysis of the process of work, Marx reveals how economic activity involves a mutual transformation between subject and object. Human beings, through work, not only change the external nature but also change their own nature.

"By acting on the external world and changing it, he is at the same time changing his own nature. He develops a slumbering potentiality within nature and subjects his forces to his own control" (*Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 283).

This process reveals that the dichotomy between the active subject and the passive object, which is fundamental in Cartesian dualism, cannot be maintained in the context of economic activity. Work objects (raw materials, instruments of production) are not merely passive matter, but have properties that resist and shape the subject's activity. On the contrary, the subject is not merely an active agent, but is also shaped by the objectivity of the production process.

2.3 Commodity Fetishism: Inversion of Subject and Object.

2.3.1 Mystical Character of Commodities

Marx's analysis of commodity fetishism reveals one of the most profound criticisms of philosophical dualism. In capitalist societies, the products of human labor take the form of commodities that seem to have mysterious and supernatural properties.

"The mystical character of a commodity does not arise from its use-value. It also does not arise from the content of value-determinations... From where, then, does the enigmatic character of the product of labor arise, as soon as it takes the form of a commodity? It is clear from this form itself" (*Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 164).

Commodity fetishism reveals how social relations between humans (the "subjective") appear in an inverted form as social relations between things (the "objective"). Social relations between producers are not seen directly, but only through the mediation of their products as commodities in the market.

2.3.2 Reification and False Consciousness.

György Lukács, in *History and Class Consciousness*, extends Marx's analysis of commodity fetishism into a comprehensive theory of reification. Reification refers to the process in which social relations and human activities take on the appearance of relations between things that have natural properties.

Reification is not merely an "error" in consciousness, but a necessary form of appearance of actual social relations in capitalist society. Reified consciousness is not "false" in the sense that it does not correspond to reality, but "false" in the sense that reality itself is false—that is, a reality in which human relations takes an alienated form.

"Reification is... the central structural problem of capitalist society in all its manifestations of life. For it is only in this context that the reification that arises from commodity-relations can be understood as the central structural problem of capitalist society" (Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness*, p. 83).

2.3.3 Criticism of the Dualism of Consciousness-Being

The analysis of commodity fetishism reveals the inadequacy of the traditional formulation of the relationship between consciousness and social being. Marx's famous dictum that "social being determines consciousness" should not be understood in the mechanistic sense in which the material base directly and immediately determines the ideal superstructure.

In the context of commodity fetishism, reified consciousness is both a product and a condition of alienated social relations. Consciousness does not merely "reflect" social beings, but also actively reproduces and legitimizes existing social relations through systematic forms of misrecognition.

Pierre Bourdieu developed this insight through the concept of symbolic violence, in which dominated groups actively participate in the reproduction of their own domination through the internalization of dominant categories of perception. This reveals how the relationship between "material" and "symbolic" cannot be understood in terms of simple causality, but involves complex complicity.

2.4 Real Values and Abstractions.

2.4.1 Labor Theory of Value dan Social Abstraction.

Marx's analysis of value reveals a new dimension of critique of philosophical dualism. Value is not a property inherent in commodities (which would make it purely "objective"), but it is also not a simple mental construct (which would make it purely "subjective"). Value is a social relationship that takes form as a property of things.

"Value does not have a stamp of value written on its forehead; rather, value transforms every product of labor into a social hieroglyph" (*Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 167).

Abstract labor, which constitutes the substance of value, reveals how abstraction in capitalist society is not merely a mental operation, but a real abstraction that occurs in social practice itself. When various forms of concrete labor are reduced to homogeneous abstract labor through market exchange, this abstraction is not merely conceptual but practical and real.

2.4.2 Dialectics of Abstract dan Concrete.

The relationship between abstract labor and concrete labor cannot be understood in terms of a simple opposition between the "abstract" (mental) and the "concrete" (material). Abstract labor is a real abstraction that exists only through and in concrete labor, while concrete labor in capitalist society has always been social and therefore abstract.

Sohn-Rethel, in *Intellectual and Manual Labour*, shows how commodity exchange produces forms of abstraction that are parallel to forms of philosophical abstraction. Real abstraction in the economic sphere provides the material basis for the development of abstract thinking in the intellectual sphere.

"Real abstraction of the exchange process... Generate abstraction in the head. The abstraction that governs exchange relations and the abstraction that governs thinking are both, in their substance, the abstraction of time and space that are concrete" (Sohn-Rethel, p. 20).

2.4.3 Money as Universal Equivalent.

Marx's analysis of money reveals how the universal equivalent overcomes the particularities of individual commodities and at the same time expresses them. Money is not merely an arbitrary symbol (which would make it purely conventional), but it is also not a natural property of a particular commodity (which would make it purely substantial).

Money as a universal equivalent reveals the social character of individual labor, but in an inverted form where this social character appears as a natural property of a particular thing (gold, for example). This creates the illusion that social relations are natural relations and vice versa.

2.5 Alienation and Objectification

2.5.1 Four Forms of Alienation

Marx identified four forms of alienation in capitalist production: alienation from the product of labor, from the activity of production, from species-beings, and from other workers. Each form reveals the specific aspect of distortion in the relationship between subject and object.

The alienation of the product shows how objects produced by workers confront them as alien powers. Products are no longer an expression of human creativity, but independent forces that dominate their producers. This reveals an inversion in which subjects become objects and objects become subjects.

Alienation from the activity of production reveals how human creative potentials are reduced to mere labor-power that is sold as a commodity. Activity that should be an expression of human freedom becomes forced activity that serves alien purposes.

2.5.2 Objectification versus Alienation

Marx distinguishes between objectification (Vergegenständlichung) and alienation (Entfremdung). Objectification is a necessary aspect of human activity—humans necessarily express themselves in external objects and institutions. Alienation is a specific form of objectification in which objects produced by humans confront them as alien powers.

"Workers become poorer the more wealth they produce, the more powerful and extensive their production becomes. Worker becomes a commodity that is

cheaper the more commodities he creates. By valorization of the world of things proceeds in direct proportion devaluation of the world of men" (*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, p. 71).

This distinction is important because it reveals that the solution to alienation is not the abolition of objectification (which would be impossible and undesirable), but the transformation of conditions that produce alienated forms of objectification.

2.5.3 Species-Being dan Individual-Universal Dialectic.

Marx's concept of species-being (Gattungswesen) reveals how alienation involves distortion in the relationship between the individual and the universal dimensions of human existence. In non-alienated conditions, individual activity spontaneously expresses universal human potentials, while universal potentials realize themselves through individual creativity.

Capitalism breaks this unity by reducing individual activity to mere means for private ends, while universal potentials appear as external forces that restrict individual freedom. Workers do not develop their human potentials through work, but sacrifice their potentials for survival.

2.6 Ideology and Material Practice.

2.6.1 Ideology as a Material Force.

Marx's concept of ideology cannot be understood in terms of the simple opposition between "false ideas" and "true reality". Ideology is a system of representations that has material existence in institutions, practices, and rituals of social life.

Louis Althusser developed this insight through the concept of Ideological State Apparatuses that interpellate individuals as subjects through material practices. "Ideas" do not exist in the pure mental realm, but are always materialized in specific practices.

"Ideology has material existence... ideology always exists dalam apparatus, dan its practice, atau practices. Existence ini adalah material" (Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", hal. 166).

2.6.2 Hegemoni dan Consensus

Antonio Gramsci expands Marx's analysis of ideology through the concept of hegemony that integrates coercion and consent. The hegemonic class not only dominates through force, but also leads through intellectual and cultural superiority recognized by the dominated groups.

Hegemony reveals how economic domination cannot be maintained through purely economic means, but requires the production of forms of consciousness that legitimately exist relations. This reveals a deep interpenetration between the "economic base" and the "cultural superstructure".

"The state is an entire complex of practical and theoretical activities in which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules" (Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, p. 244).

2.6.3 Contradictions dan Crisis

Marxist analysis reveals how contradictions in the economic structure necessarily produce crises that threaten the stability of the system as a whole. These contradictions are not simple logical inconsistencies, but real tensions between different aspects of the system that threatens its reproduction.

Crisis tidak semata-mata economic phenomena, tetapi also crises of legitimacy yang involve transformation dalam forms of consciousness. Economic crisis creates conditions di mana dominant ideology becomes questionable dan alternative forms of consciousness dapat emerge.

2.7 Contemporary Developments dan Implications.

2.7.1 Post-Fordism dan Immaterial Labor.

Contemporary developments in capitalism, particularly the transition from Fordist mass production to post-Fordist flexible accumulation, reveal new forms of interpenetration between material and symbolic dimensions.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, in *Empire*, analyze the rise of "immaterial labor" that involves the production of communication, affects, and social relations. Immaterial labor reveals that the distinction between "productive" and "unproductive" labor, or between "economic" and "cultural" activities, becomes increasingly problematic.

"Immaterial labor constitutes itself in forms that are immediately collective, and we may say that immaterial labor exists in the form of networks and flows" (Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, p. 294).

2.7.2 Financialization dan Virtual Economy

The financialization of contemporary capitalism creates new forms of abstraction that are even further removed from material production. Financial instruments such as derivatives create "virtual" wealth that has real effects but does not directly correspond to the underlying material values.

Christian Marazzi analyzes how financial markets operate as "language machines" that produce meaning and value through linguistic operations. This reveals that contemporary capitalism involves new forms of integration between symbolic and material dimensions.

2.7.3 Digital Economy dan Platform Capitalism.

The rise of digital platforms creates new forms of value extraction that blur the boundaries between production and consumption, work and life, economic and social activities. Users of social media platforms are simultaneously consumers of content and producers of data that becomes a source of value for platform owners.

Shoshana Zuboff's analysis of "surveillance capitalism" reveals how personal data becomes a "behavioral surplus" that is extracted for prediction and modification of human behavior. This represents a new stage in the development of capitalism where not only labor-power but also subjectivity itself becomes the source of value.

2.8 Conclusion: Towards Post-Dualistic Understanding.

Analysis of economic structure reveals the fundamental inadequacy of dualistic frameworks in understanding social reality. Economic relations cannot be understood in terms of simple opposition between the material base and the ideal superstructure, or between objective conditions and subjective consciousness.

Marx's critique of political economy developed new forms of dialectical thinking that could grasp the interpenetration between subject and object, individual and social, particular and universal, without reducing one term to another or treating them as separate substances.

Contemporary developments in capitalism create new challenges for understanding that require further development of non-dualistic approaches. The challenge for critical theory is to develop conceptual tools that can grasp the complexity of contemporary social reality without falling back into dualistic assumptions that have been shown inadequate.

Key insights that emerge from this analysis:

1. **Material-Symbolic Integration**: Economic relations always involve interpenetration dari material dan symbolic dimensions yang tidak dapat separated tanpa distortion.
2. **Real Abstraction**: Abstraction in modern society is not merely a mental operation but a real social process that has material effects.
3. **Subject-Object Dialectic**: Economic activity involves mutual transformation dari subjects dan objects yang challenges simple active-passive oppositions.
4. **Totality thinking**: Economic relations must be understood as aspects of complex social totality, not as a separate sphere governed by purely economic laws.
5. **Historical Specificity**: Forms dari consciousness dan forms dari social being are historically specific dan mutually constituting, bukan eternal oppositions.

Analysis ini provides foundation untuk further investigation dari other structural dimensions yang challenge dualistic assumptions dan point toward more adequate forms dari social understanding.

CHAPTER 3

CHAPTER 3 : POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND DECONSTRUCTION OF POWER-AUTHORITY DUALISM

3.1 Introduction: Politics as an Arena of Material-Symbolic Interpenetration

Political structures in modern society present theoretical complexities that fundamentally challenge the Cartesian dichotomy between res extensa and res cogitans. When we analyze political phenomena—from the legitimacy of power to the formation of the modern state—we find that political reality cannot be understood through a simple separation between "material power" and "symbolic consensus," or between "physical coercion" and "ideological persuasion."

Max Weber, through his analysis of political legitimacy, reveals how authority cannot be reduced to mere force or pure consent, but involves a complex interpenetration between the material and the symbolic dimensions. Antonio Gramsci

deepens this insight through the concept of hegemony which shows how political dominance requires the organic integration of coercion and consent, domination and leadership.

Pierre Bourdieu developed this understanding further through the concept of symbolic violence which reveals how political domination operates through systematic misrecognition that makes relations of domination appear natural and legitimate. Michel Foucault shows how power in modern society is not only repressive but also productive, not only forbidding but also producing subjects, knowledge, and forms of life.

This chapter will explore how political structures reveal the fundamental limitations of dualistic frameworks and demand the development of conceptual tools that can capture the complexity of interpenetration between material and symbolic dimensions in political reality.

3.2 Fundamental Terminology and Etymological Analysis.

3.2.1 Power versus Authority.

- **Power** comes from the Latin *potere* which means "to be able" or "to be able to do." In the context of politics, power refers to the capacity to influence or control the actions of others, regardless of the basis of legitimacy. Max Weber defined power as "the opportunity to enforce one's will in a social relationship, even against resistance, no matter what the basis of this opportunity is."
- **Authority** (Herrschaft) has a more complex etymology. Derived from the German *herr* (lord/master) and *-schaft* (suffix denoting condition or quality), Herrschaft refers to a form of power that is considered legitimate by those who submit to it. Weber differentiates authority from mere power through the legitimacy dimension—authority is "the probability that a particular order will be obeyed by a certain group of people."

This distinction is crucial because it reveals that political relations cannot be understood purely in terms of force or purely in terms of consent, but involves complex interplay between the two dimensions.

3.2.2 Legitimacy dan Legitimation

Legitimacy comes from the Latin *legitimus*, which means "according to law" or "lawful." However, in Weber's analysis, legitimacy is not limited to legal conformity but includes a broader sense of rightfulness or acceptability.

Weber identifies three pure types of legitimate authority:

1. **Traditional Authority**: Berdasarkan sanctity of tradition dan personal loyalty
2. **Charismatic Authority**: Based on devotion to the exceptional qualities of individual leaders
3. **Legal-Rational Authority**: Based on belief in the legality of enacted rules and right of command

Setiap type melibatkan different forms of interpenetration antara material dan symbolic elements. Traditional authority mengandalkan material symbols (regalia, ceremonies) dan symbolic traditions (customs, precedents). Charismatic authority mengombinasikan extraordinary personal qualities dengan material demonstrations of power. Legal-rational authority mengintegrasikan bureaucratic apparatus dengan normative beliefs tentang procedural correctness.

3.2.3 Hegemony (Hegemonie) dan Cultural Leadership

Hegemony comes from the Greek *word hegemony*, which means "leadership" or "dominance." Gramsci transformed this concept from political science into critical theory by showing how the ruling class maintains dominance not only through state coercion but also through cultural leadership in civil society.

Hegemony differs from simple domination because it involves the active consent of the dominated groups. However, this consent is not freely given but produced through complex processes of ideological work that shapes common sense and forms of consciousness.

Gramsci distinguishes between:

- **Dominio** (domination): Direct coercion melalui state apparatus
- **Direzione** (direction/leadership): Cultural influence melalui civil society institutions

The hegemonic class must be capable of intellectual and moral leadership, not just economic dominance. This reveals how political power requires integration between material control and symbolic authority.

3.2.4 Symbolic violence.

Bourdieu developed the concept **of symbolic violence** to describe forms of domination that are not recognized as domination by those who experience them. Symbolic violence operates through the imposition of systems of meaning that legitimately exist power relations.

"Symbolic violence is violence perpetrated with the complicity of those who experience it and, to a certain extent, of those who do it, to the extent that both parties are unaware that they are committing or experiencing it" (Bourdieu, *Masculine Domination*, pp. 1-2).

This concept reveals how political domination operates not only through external coercion but also through the internalization of dominant categories of perception and appreciation. Symbolic violence overcomes the dichotomy between "objective structures" and "subjective dispositions" by showing how structures are reproduced through incorporated dispositions.

3.3 Max Weber: The Typology of Authority and the Problem of Legitimacy.

3.3.1 Traditional Authority and Patrimonialism.

Weber analyzes traditional authority as a form of domination that is based on a belief in the sanctity of traditions and the legitimacy of their status called by tradition to exercise authority. Traditional authority reveals the complex interpenetration between symbolic beliefs and material practices.

In patrimonial systems, the ruler maintains authority through a combination of:

- **Personal Loyalty**: Berdasarkan traditional obligations dan emotional attachments
- **Material Benefices**: Distribution of material rewards kepada followers
- **Symbolic Legitimation**: Invocation of sacred traditions dan ancestral precedents

Weber points out that traditional authority cannot be understood as a pure "symbolic" phenomenon because it always involves a material apparatus of administration and distribution. On the contrary, it is also not purely "material" because it depends on shared beliefs about the rightfulness of traditional arrangements.

A paradigmatic example is the medieval feudal system in which lord-vassal relations involved both material exchanges (land grants, military service) and symbolic bonds (oaths of loyalty, ceremonies of homage). The legitimacy of this system depends on the recognition of both parties that material exchanges are an expression of deeper spiritual and traditional obligations.

3.3.2 Charismatic Authority and Revolutionary Leadership.

Charismatic authority represents most dramatic challenge kepada conventional dualistic thinking karena it involves belief dalam extraordinary qualities of individual yang transcends ordinary categories of evaluation. Charismatic leader memiliki authority berdasarkan personal qualities yang dianggap supernatural, superhuman, atau exceptional.

Weber identifies several characteristics of charismatic authority:

- **Personal Devotion**: Followers devoted to the leader as a person, not to office or tradition
- **Revolutionary Potential**: Charismatic authority dapat break traditional atau rational-legal patterns
- **Routinization Problem**: Charismatic authority faces crisis of succession dan institutionalization

Charismatic authority reveals the limitations of simple material-ideal distinction because charismatic qualities, whether "spiritual" or "personal," must be constantly demonstrated through material successes. Prophets must perform miracles, military leaders must win battles, political leaders must deliver concrete benefits.

A historical example is the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte, who gained charismatic authority through a combination of personal qualities (military genius, political vision) and material achievements (military victories, administrative reforms). His legitimacy cannot be reduced to pure force (because he needs popular support) or pure consent (because he uses considerable coercion).

3.3.3 Legal-Rational Authority and Modern Bureaucracy.

Legal-rational authority represents most complex form of interpenetration antara material dan symbolic dimensions. Legitimacy berdasarkan belief dalam legality of enacted rules dan right of those elevated to authority under such rules untuk issue commands.

Key features of legal-rational authority include:

- **Impersonal Rules**: Authority attached kepada office, bukan person
- **Hierarchical Organization**: Clear chain of command dan spheres of competence
- **Professional Administration**: Separation of administrative staff dari means of administration
- **Written Documentation**: Formal procedures dan record-keeping

Weber points out that the bureaucratic apparatus cannot be understood as a purely "technical" or "material" instrument because its effectiveness depends on shared beliefs about the legitimacy of bureaucratic procedures. In contrast, legal-rational beliefs are not purely "ideal" because they materialize in institutional structures and administrative practices.

Modern bureaucracy exposes the paradox that the rationalization process designed to eliminate arbitrary personal authority creates new forms of domination that are more systematic and pervasive than traditional forms. The "iron cage" of bureaucratic rationality shows how symbolic commitments to efficiency and rationality can produce material effects that constrain human freedom.

3.4 Antonio Gramsci: Hegemoni dan Integrasi Coercion-Consent.

3.4.1 State in Narrow and Broad Sense.

Gramsci developed a conception of the state that transcends the simple dichotomy between the coercive apparatus and ideological institutions. He distinguishes between:

- **State in the narrow sense** (political society): Apparatus of direct coercion—army, police, courts, prisons. This is the domain of the domain where the ruling class uses force to maintain the order.
- **State dalam broad sense** (political society + civil society): Includes institutions yang shape common sense dan cultural values—schools, churches, media, cultural organizations. Ini adalah domain dari direzione di mana ruling class exercises intellectual dan moral leadership.

"State = political society + civil society, dalam other words hegemony armored by coercion" (Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, hal. 263).

This formula reveals that political domination cannot be maintained through coercion alone but requires the production of consent through cultural work in civil society. However, this consent is not purely voluntary because it is shaped by structural constraints and backed by potential coercion.

3.4.2 War of Position versus War of Movement

Gramsci developed military metaphors to describe different strategies of political struggle:

- **War of Movement** (guerra di movimento): Direct assault pada state apparatus, appropriate dalam conditions di mana civil society is weak dan state dominance is primarily coercive.
- **War of Position** (guerra di posizione): Prolonged struggle untuk cultural hegemony dalam civil society, necessary dalam advanced capitalist societies di mana ruling class has developed sophisticated forms of cultural leadership.

This distinction reveals that political transformation in modern societies cannot be achieved through purely material means (seizure of state apparatus) or purely ideological means (change in consciousness), but requires an integrated strategy that addresses both material structures and cultural formations.

An example of a war of position is the struggle for educational reform where progressive forces are not only advocates for material changes (increased funding, better facilities) but also for cultural transformation (critical pedagogy, alternative curricula). Success requires a combination of material resources and symbolic legitimacy.

3.4.3 Organic Intellectuals dan Cultural Production

Gramsci analyzes the role of intellectuals in the maintenance and transformation of hegemonic relations. He distinguishes between:

- **Traditional Intellectuals**: Those yang appear autonomous dari dominant class tetapi actually serve untuk legitimate existing arrangements (clergy, academics, literary figures).
- **Organic Intellectuals**: Those yang emerge dari particular class dan articulate its worldview dan interests (business managers, political organizers, cultural critics).

Every class, menurut Gramsci, produces its own organic intellectuals yang responsible untuk developing dan disseminating its conception of world. Struggle untuk hegemony involves competition antara different groups of intellectuals untuk influence popular consciousness.

Organic intellectuals not only work in the realm of ideas but also in the practical organization of society. They bridge the gap between abstract theory and concrete practice, between intellectual conception and popular common sense.

A contemporary example is the role of think tanks in American politics, which combine rigorous intellectual work with practical political advocacy. The Heritage Foundation or the Brookings Institution are not purely academic institutions but organic intellectuals from conservative or liberal establishments that work to develop and disseminate worldviews that support particular political agendas.

3.5 Pierre Bourdieu: Symbolic Violence dan Political Field.

3.5.1 Political Field sebagai Space of Competition.

Bourdieu conceptualized the political sphere as a field—a relatively autonomous space of competition in which agents struggle for the accumulation of political capital. The political field has its own logic that cannot be reduced to economic or cultural determinants, but also is not autonomous from broader social structures.

Key features of the political field include:

- **Specific Capital**: Political capital yang accumulated melalui recognition, reputation, dan access to resources
- **Doxa**: Unquestioned beliefs yang structure political competition
- **Illusio**: Investment dalam political game yang makes competition meaningful
- **Homology**: Correspondence between positions in the political field and positions in social space

The political field reveals how political struggles are not purely ideological (conflicts over ideas) or purely material (conflicts over resources), but involve complex interplay between symbolic recognition and material advantage.

3.5.2 Symbolic Capital dan Political Representation.

Bourdieu analyzes political representation as a form of symbolic alchemy in which representatives can speak and act on behalf of represented groups.

Representational relationship involves mysterious transformation in which the individual can embody collective will.

"Political representation is the miracle of ministration through which the spokesperson becomes the group he speaks to, a group that exists only through and in the spokesperson who speaks to it" (Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 204).

The symbolic power of political representation cannot be understood as purely conventional (because it has real material effects) or purely substantial (because it depends on recognition by others). Representatives have power only insofar as representation is recognized as legitimate by both the represented group and the broader society.

3.5.3 State sebagai Monopoly of Symbolic Violence

Bourdieu develops Weber's definition of the state as a monopoly of legitimate violence by showing that the modern state also has a monopoly of legitimate symbolic violence. The state not only has the right to use physical force but also the power to impose categories of perception and appreciation that structure social reality.

"State adalah culmination dari process of concentration of different species of capital—physical force, economic capital, cultural capital, symbolic capital—yang leads ke constitution of specific capital, properly statist capital, yang gives state power over different fields dan over different species of capital, dan particularly over rates of conversion antara them" (Bourdieu, *Practical Reason*, hal. 41).

State's symbolic power is exercised melalui :

- **Official Nomination**: Power untuk classify people dan things through official categories
- **Educational Credentialing**: Control over legitimate forms of cultural capital
- **Statistical Classification**: Production of official knowledge about social reality
- **Legal Codification**: Authority to define rights and obligations

3.6 Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge dan Disciplinary Mechanisms.

3.6.1 From Sovereign Power to Disciplinary Power.

Foucault analyzes the historical transformation of forms of political power, particularly the transition from sovereign power (which is based on the right of death) to disciplinary power (which focuses on the management of life). This

transformation reveals the inadequacy of traditional conceptions of power as a purely repressive force.

- **Sovereign Power**: Characteristic dari medieval dan early modern periods, sovereign power operates melalui spectacular displays of force dan punishment. King has absolute right atas life dan death dari subjects, tetapi this power is exercised sporadically dan primarily negatively (through prohibition dan punishment).
- **Disciplinary Power**: Emerges dalam 18th century sebagai new form of power yang operates melalui normalization rather than punishment, training rather than spectacle. Disciplinary power is positive dan productive—it creates subjects rather than simply repressing them.

"We must cease once dan for all untuk describe effects of power dalam negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. Dalam fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects dan rituals of truth" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, hal. 194).

3.6.2 Panopticon as a Diagram of Power.

Foucault used Bentham's Panopticon as a metaphor for disciplinary power. Panopticon is an architectural design for prisons in which the central tower allows the guard to observe all prisoners without being observed himself. Prisoners do not know when they are being watched, so they must assume constant surveillance.

Panoptic principle extends beyond prison untuk include schools, hospitals, factories, dan other modern institutions. What makes disciplinary power effective adalah not continuous surveillance tetapi possibility of surveillance yang internalizes control dalam subjects themselves.

"Hence major effect of Panopticon: untuk induce dalam inmate state of conscious dan permanent visibility yang assures automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, hal. 201).

Panopticon reveals how modern power operates through the production of self-disciplining subjects rather than external coercion. Subjects learn to monitor and regulate themselves according to internalized norms.

3.6.3 Biopower dan Population Management

Foucault identified the emergence of biopower in the 18th century as a form of power that targeted not individual bodies but populations as biological species. Biopower operates through statistical knowledge and administrative techniques that manage birth rates, death rates, health conditions, and other biological processes.

Biopower involves two poles:

- **Discipline**: Technologies that target individual bodies to make them docile and productive
- **Regulation**: Technologies yang target populations untuk manage biological processes

"One might say that the old right to take life or let live is replaced by the power to foster life or disallow it to point of death" (Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, Vol. 1, p. 138).

Biopower mengungkap bagaimana modern politics tidak hanya about governing people tetapi also about managing life itself. Political power extends into most intimate aspects dari human existence—sexuality, health, reproduction, longevity.

3.7 Case Study: Legitimacy in the Modern Political Context

3.7.1 The Case of the 1998 Indonesian Revolution: The Crisis of Authority Legitimacy

The fall of the Suharto regime in May 1998 provides a paradigmatic example of the crisis of legitimacy that reveals the complex interpenetration between material and symbolic dimensions in political domination.

Material Dimensions:

- Economic crisis yang triggered oleh Asian Financial Crisis 1997
- Massive unemployment dan social dislocation
- Shortages dari basic commodities dan rising prices
- Weakening dari military apparatus karena internal divisions

Symbolic Dimensions:

- Loss of charismatic legitimacy karena Soeharto's advanced age dan perceived incompetence
- Erosion of traditional authority karena violation of Javanese cultural norms
- Collapse of developmental narrative yang had legitimized authoritarian rule
- Emergence of alternative discourses (reformasi, democracy, human rights)

Yang significant adalah bahwa neither material conditions alone nor symbolic delegitimation alone was sufficient untuk produce regime change. Economic crisis tanpa symbolic alternatives might have produced temporary unrest. Symbolic opposition tanpa material crisis might have been contained melalui traditional methods of co-optation dan repression.

Crisis of legitimacy terjadi ketika material contradictions (economic failure) combined dengan symbolic contradictions (loss of credibility) dalam way yang made existing arrangements untenable. New political forces (student movement, civil society organizations, opposition parties) were able untuk articulate alternative vision yang connected material demands (economic reform) dengan symbolic aspirations (democracy, justice).

3.7.2 The Case of the 2016 United States Presidential Election: Populism and the Crisis of Representation.

The election of Donald Trump as President of the United States in 2016 exposed a crisis in traditional forms of political representation that challenges conventional understandings of political legitimacy.

- **Challenge kepada Legal-Rational Authority:** Trump's appeals kepada personal loyalty dan charismatic leadership challenged bureaucratic norms dan institutional procedures. His criticism of "deep state" dan professional expertise undermined legitimate authority dari administrative apparatus.
- **Symbolic Violence dan Counter-Hegemonic Discourse:** Trump's campaign successfully articulated populist discourse yang challenged dominant cultural narratives. "Make America Great Again" slogan constructed alternative common sense yang valorized working-class identity dan criticized cosmopolitan elites.
- **Media dan Information Warfare:** Traditional gatekeeping role dari mainstream media was challenged oleh social media platforms yang allowed direct communication antara political leaders dan supporters. "Fake news" discourse challenged monopoly dari established institutions atas legitimate knowledge.
- **Material Basis dari Symbolic Appeal:** Trump's populist appeals resonated dengan material conditions dari economic inequality, deindustrialization, dan social displacement dalam Rust Belt states. Symbolic opposition kepada cultural elites was grounded dalam real economic grievances.

This analysis reveals that political legitimacy in contemporary conditions cannot be understood through Weber's traditional typology alone but requires attention to new forms of mediation, representation, and symbolic struggle.

3.7.3 Kasus Brexit: Sovereignty dan Democratic Legitimacy.

The Brexit referendum in 2016 exposed fundamental tensions in contemporary conceptions of political authority and democratic legitimacy.

Clash of Legitimacy Claims:

- **Parliamentary Sovereignty**: Traditional British constitutional principle yang gives Parliament ultimate authority
- **Popular Sovereignty**: Democratic principle yang gives ultimate authority kepada popular will
- **European Integration**: Supranational authority yang limits national sovereignty

- **Expert Knowledge**: Technocratic authority based pada economic dan legal expertise

---

1. **Symbolic Dimensions:** Brexit campaign successfully mobilized symbolic appeals kepada national identity, sovereignty, dan democratic control. "Take Back Control" slogan articulated desire untuk restored national autonomy dalam face of supranational integration.
2. **Material Contradictions:** Economic arguments about costs dan benefits dari EU membership were contested dan inconclusive. Different regions dan social groups had different material interests dalam EU membership.
3. **Crisis of Representation:** Brexit revealed gap antara political elites (yang generally supported EU membership) dan significant portion dari popular opinion (yang supported leaving). Traditional mechanisms of representative democracy seemed inadequate untuk resolve this conflict.
4. **Resolution melalui Direct Democracy:** Decision untuk hold referendum represented attempt untuk resolve legitimacy crisis melalui direct appeal kepada popular will. However, this created new problems tentang interpretation dan implementation of ambiguous popular mandate.

The Brexit case reveals that democratic legitimacy in complex modern societies cannot be reduced to simple majoritarianism or expert authority, but requires sophisticated mechanisms to balance different claims and interests.

3.8 Implications for Contemporary Political Philosophy

3.8.1 Beyond Consent-Coercion Dichotomy

Analysis of political structure reveals that the traditional dichotomy between consensual and coercive forms of authority is not adequate for understanding the complexity of contemporary political relations. Political domination operates through subtle combinations of material constraints and symbolic violence that transcends simple opposition between force and consent.

Contemporary forms of political power—surveillance capitalism, algorithmic governance, biometric control—create new hybrid forms yang tidak easily classified according kepada traditional categories. These new forms require

development of conceptual tools yang dapat grasp their specificity tanpa falling back onto dualistic assumptions.

3.8.2 Crisis of Liberal Democratic Legitimacy.

Contemporary political developments—rise of populism, decline of trust dalam institutions, fragmentation of public sphere—suggest crisis dalam liberal democratic forms of legitimacy. Traditional mechanisms of representation, deliberation, dan consent formation seem inadequate for addressing contemporary challenges.

Crisis ini tidak purely institutional atau purely cultural, tetapi involves interaction antara material conditions (inequality, technological change, globalization) dan symbolic transformations (fragmentation of shared narratives, proliferation of alternative media, decline of deference kepada expertise).

3.8.3 New Forms of Political Subjectivity.

Analysis dari symbolic violence dan disciplinary power suggests that political subjects are not pre-given tetapi produced melalui specific mechanisms of subjectification. Contemporary political struggles involve not hanya competition untuk power tetapi also competition untuk define forms of subjectivity dan modes of existence.

Environmental movements, feminist movements, indigenous rights movements represent attempts untuk articulate new forms of political subjectivity yang challenge dominant categories of perception dan appreciation. These movements show bahwa political transformation requires not hanya change dalam institutions tetapi also transformation dalam forms of consciousness dan modes of being.

3.9 Conclusion: Towards Post-Dualistic Political Theory.

Analysis of political structure reveals the fundamental inadequacy of dualistic frameworks for understanding political reality. Political relations cannot be understood in terms of simple oppositions between material and ideal, coercion and consent, power and authority, or domination and legitimacy.

Key insights that emerge from this analysis:

1. **Material-Symbolic Integration**: Political power always involves interpenetration dari material constraints dan symbolic legitimation yang tidak dapat separated tanpa distortion.
2. **Productive Character of Power**: Modern power adalah not purely repressive tetapi also productive—it creates subjects, knowledge, dan forms of life rather than simply constraining them.

3. **Field Logic**: Political struggles occur within relatively autonomous fields yang have their own logic tetapi are connected kepada broader social structures melalui complex relationships of homology dan translation.
4. **Crisis of Traditional Legitimacy**: Contemporary political developments challenge traditional forms of legitimacy dan require development of new conceptual tools untuk understanding emerging forms of political authority.
5. **Subjectification Processes**: Political subjects are not pre-given tetapi produced melalui specific mechanisms yang involve both material practices dan symbolic interpellation.

Analysis ini provides foundation untuk further investigation dari other structural dimensions yang challenge dualistic assumptions dan point toward more adequate forms of political understanding yang dapat address complexity of contemporary political reality.

BAB 4.

CHAPTER 4 : CULTURAL STRUCTURE AND TRANSCENDENCE OF THE MEANING-MATTER DICHOTOMY

4.1 Introduction: Culture as an Irreducible Ontological Field.

The structure of culture in human society presents the most profound challenge to Cartesian dualism, because culture inherently involves the inseparable interpenetration between material and symbolic dimensions, between praxis and meaning, between embodiment and representation. When René Descartes formulated a firm separation between res extensa and res cogitans, he did not anticipate that cultural phenomena would reveal the fundamental limitations of the dichotomy.

Pierre Bourdieu, through the concept of cultural capital and habitus, shows that cultural distinctions cannot be understood as mere matters of taste or preference separate from material conditions, but rather as mechanisms of social reproduction that involve the embodiment of cultural dispositions in concrete social

practices. Cultural capital operates as a form of power that is simultaneously symbolic and material—symbolic because it involves systems of meaning and classification, material because it has convertibility with economic capital and produces real advantages in social struggles.

Clifford Geertz developed an understanding of culture as a "web of meaning" that requires an interpretive approach that goes beyond the explanation-understanding dichotomy (erklären-verstehen). The thick description he proposes reveals that cultural phenomena cannot be understood through mechanistic causal explanations or through idealistic pure hermeneutic understanding, but rather requires interpretive analysis that can capture the complexity of layered meanings in cultural practices.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty shows that cultural meaning is inseparable from bodily experience and perceptual engagement with the world.

Cultural symbols and practices have always been embodied in the sensorimotor experience that precedes and grounds abstract conceptual understanding. Raymond Williams reveals how culture as a "whole way of life" involves the integration of material practices and symbolic forms that cannot be reduced to one another.

This chapter will explore how cultural structures reveal the inadequacy of dualistic frameworks and demand the development of conceptual tools that can capture the complexity of cultural phenomena without falling into reductionist traps of both materialists and idealists.

4.2 Fundamental Terminology and Etymological Analysis.

4.2.1 Culture dan Cultivation: From Agriculture to Civilization.

Culture comes from the Latin *word cultura*, which originally meant cultivation or tending of crops. The root word *colere* means "to till," "to inhabit," "to worship," revealing the semantic richness that connects physical cultivation of land with spiritual cultivation of mind and social cultivation of community.

Raymond Williams, in *Keywords*, identifies three general categories in modern uses of culture:

1. **Process of intellectual, spiritual, dan aesthetic development** (individual cultivation)
2. **Particular way of life** of people, period, atau group (anthropological sense)

3. **Works dan practices of intellectual dan artistic activity** (artistic/literary sense)

This etymology reveals that the concept of culture from the beginning involves the integration between material practices (agriculture, craftsmanship) and symbolic meanings (worship, intellectual development). Cultivation cannot be reduced to pure material labor or pure spiritual activity, but involves transformative relationships between humans and their environment that are simultaneously practical and meaningful.

4.2.2 Habitus: Embodied Dispositions dan Structured Structuring Structures

Habitus in Bourdieu's usage comes from the Aristotelian concept of *hexis*, which refers to acquired dispositions or habits that become "second nature." Thomas Aquinas transliterated the Greek *hexis* as Latin *habitus* in scholastic philosophy.

Bourdieu defines habitus as: "Systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, i.e. as principles that generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing conscious aiming at ends or expressing mastery of operations necessary in order to attain them" (*Logic of Practice*, p. 53).

This definition reveals that habitus transcends the dichotomy between subjective voluntarism and objective determinism. Habitus is neither pure freedom (because it is structured by past experiences) nor pure constraint (because it generates creative responses to new situations). It embodies dialectical relationships between structure and agency, past and present, individual and social.

Habitus operates below level of conscious decision-making, generating "reasonable" practices tanpa explicit reasoning. It is embodied dalam posture, gesture, accent, taste, dan other bodily hexis yang unconsciously signal class position dan cultural belonging.

4.2.3 Cultural Capital: Symbolic Power dan Social Reproduction

Capital traditionally refers kepada economic resources yang dapat invested untuk generate returns. Bourdieu extends concept kepada non-economic forms of advantage yang operate according kepada similar logic of accumulation, conversion, dan transmission.

Bourdieu identifies three forms of cultural capital:

1. **Incorporated State** (état incorporé): Cultural capital yang embodied dalam person dalam form of lasting dispositions, skills, dan competences. Cannot be transmitted instantly tetapi requires time untuk acquisition through socialization dan education.
2. **Objectified State** (état objectivé): Cultural capital dalam form of cultural goods—books, paintings, instruments, machines. Dapat appropriated materially (through ownership) tetapi symbolic appropriation requires incorporated cultural capital.
3. **Institutionalized State** (état institutionnalisé): Cultural capital yang officially recognized through credentials, degrees, titles. Provides institutional guarantee of cultural competence yang independent of person who bears it.

Cultural capital mengungkap bahwa symbolic distinctions have material effects. Taste, manner, accent, educational credentials serve sebagai markers of social position yang provide access kepada social networks, employment opportunities, dan cultural privileges. What appears sebagai natural talent atau aesthetic preference is actually result of social inheritance dan cultivation.

4.2.4 Symbolic Violence: Misrecognition dan Legitimation.

Symbolic Violence refers kepada imposition of systems of meaning yang legitimate existing power relations without being recognized sebagai violence. It operates through complicity of those yang mengalami it, because they apply categories of perception yang product of asymmetrical relationship of power.

"Symbolic violence is gentle violence, imperceptible and invisible even to its victims, exerted for the most part through purely symbolic channels of communication and cognition (more precisely, misrecognition), recognition, or even feeling" (Bourdieu, *Masculine Domination*, p. 1).

Symbolic violence berbeda dari physical violence karena it requires complicity dari dominated party. Domination tidak imposed from outside tetapi reproduced through dominated party's own classificatory schemes yang product of objective structures. Dominated groups participate dalam their own domination dengan accepting categories yang devalue their own cultural practices.

Example adalah way working-class students internalize meritocratic ideology yang attributes their educational failure kepada personal inadequacy rather than structural disadvantage. They accept legitimate culture sebagai superior dan devalue their own cultural background, thereby contributing kepada reproduction of cultural hierarchy.

4.2.5 Thick Description: Interpretive Density dan Cultural Analysis

Thick Description is a methodological concept developed by Gilbert Ryle and adopted by Clifford Geertz for anthropological analysis. Contrasts with "thin descriptions" that merely report behavioral facts.

Geertz uses Ryle's example of winking to illustrate the distinction:

- **Thin description**: "rapidly contracting his right eyelid"
- **Thick description**: "practicing a burlesque of a friend faking a wink to deceive an innocent into thinking a conspiracy is in motion"

Thick description involves interpretation of interpretations—understanding how cultural actors themselves understand their actions dalam context of shared symbolic systems. It requires attention kepada multiple layers of meaning dan context yang make actions culturally significant.

"What we call our data are really our own constructions of other people's constructions of what they dan their compatriots are up to" (Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, hal. 9).

Thick description mengungkap bahwa cultural phenomena cannot be understood through simple observation atau causal analysis, tetapi require interpretive reconstruction of meaning-making processes that inform cultural practices.

4.3 Pierre Bourdieu: Cultural Capital dan Distinction.

4.3.1 Field Theory dan Cultural Production.

Bourdieu mengonseptualisasikan cultural sphere sebagai field—relatively autonomous space of competition dalam mana agents struggle untuk accumulation of cultural capital. Cultural field has its own logic yang cannot be reduced kepada economic atau political determinants, but is connected kepada other fields through complex relationships of homology dan conversion.

Key characteristics dari cultural field :

- **Specific Capital**: Cultural capital yang valued within field (aesthetic competence, critical judgment, creative talent)
- **Doxa**: Unquestioned beliefs yang structure competition (art for art's sake, genius, originality)
- **Illusio**: Investment dalam cultural game yang makes struggle meaningful

- **Autonomy**: Relative independence dari external demands, especially economic logic

Cultural field contains sub-fields (literary field, artistic field, academic field) dan positions (avant-garde, consecrated, commercial) yang correspond kepada different strategies untuk accumulating cultural capital. Position dalam field determines access kepada symbolic profits (recognition, prestige, influence) yang can be converted into other forms of capital.

4.3.2 Habitus dan Cultural Practices

Habitus generates cultural practices yang appear spontaneous dan natural tetapi actually correspond kepada objective class conditions. Different class positions produce different habitus yang dispose individuals toward different cultural preferences dan practices.

- **Bourgeois Habitus**: Characterized oleh aesthetic distance, cultural refinement, dan "pure" taste yang rejects instrumental attitude toward culture. Bourgeois culture cultivates disinterested appreciation yang treats cultural objects sebagai ends in themselves rather than means untuk other purposes.
- **Petite Bourgeoisie Habitus**: Characterized oleh cultural good will dan educational aspiration. Petite bourgeoisie recognizes legitimate culture dan strives untuk cultural advancement, but lacks secure possession of cultural capital yang allows effortless mastery.
- **Working Class Habitus**: Characterized oleh practical relationship kepada culture yang values functionality over aesthetics. Working class culture emphasizes substance over form, utility over beauty, straightforward expression over sophisticated refinement.

These differences bukan simple preferences tetapi structured dispositions yang reflect material conditions of existence. Class position generates specific forms of experience yang become incorporated sebagai lasting dispositions that organize future practices.

4.3.3 Distinction dan Social Reproduction

Bourdieu's analysis dalam *Distinction* menunjukkan how cultural preferences serve sebagai markers of social position dan mechanisms of social closure.

Taste classifies classifier—cultural choices reveal social position while simultaneously reinforcing social boundaries.

1. **Cultural Legitimacy**: Dominant class culture is established sebagai legitimate culture melalui educational system dan cultural institutions. Legitimate culture is presented sebagai universal standard rather than particular class culture, making cultural hierarchy appear natural rather than arbitrary.
2. **Cultural Violence**: Imposition of legitimate culture devalues working-class cultural practices dan treats them sebagai lacking, vulgar, atau inferior. Working-class culture is seen sebagai absence of culture rather than different form of culture.
3. **Symbolic Domination**: Cultural hierarchy translates into symbolic domination yang reinforces class domination. Those dengan high cultural capital appear naturally superior, while those tanpa cultural capital appear naturally inferior.

Cultural reproduction works through educational system yang formally treats all students equally while actually favoring those yang possess cultural capital dari their family background. Educational success appears meritocratic while actually reproducing class privilege through cultural transmission.

4.3.4 Conversion Strategies dan Cultural Investment

Bourdieu analyzes the different strategies that agents use to convert cultural capital into other forms of capital or to transmit cultural advantages to the next generation.

1. **Strategies of Reconversion**: When economic capital becomes insufficient to maintain class position, families invest in cultural capital as an alternative pathway for social reproduction. Declining bourgeoisie may pursue intellectual careers or cultural production as a way of maintaining distinction.
2. **Educational Investment**: Families invest dalam children's education sebagai way of converting economic capital into cultural credentials. Educational system provides seemingly objective measure of merit yang legitimizes class reproduction.
3. **Cultural Investment**: Investment dalam cultural goods, practices, dan experiences yang signal cultural competence dan provide cultural capital. Museum attendance, concert subscriptions, art collections serve sebagai forms of cultural investment.

Success of these strategies depends on market conditions untuk different forms of capital. When cultural capital has high conversion rate, cultural

investment is profitable. When economic opportunities are scarce, cultural capital may provide alternative pathways untuk social advancement.

4.4 Clifford Geertz: Culture sebagai Web of Meaning.

4.4.1 Interpretive Anthropology dan Symbolic Action.

Geertz mengembangkan interpretive approach kepada anthropology yang treats culture sebagai publicly available systems of meaning rather than private mental phenomena. Culture consists of symbols dan symbolic actions yang shared oleh members of community dan available untuk public interpretation.

"Culture adalah historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied dalam symbols, system of inherited conceptions expressed dalam symbolic forms dengan mana men communicate, perpetuate, dan develop their knowledge about dan attitudes toward life" (Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, hal. 89).

Interpretive anthropology focuses on meaning-making processes rather than causal mechanisms. Instead of asking what causes cultural phenomena, interpretive anthropology asks what cultural phenomena mean untuk actors yang participate dalam them dan how these meanings are constructed dan transmitted.

Cultural analysis becomes exercise dalam reading social action sebagai text yang requires interpretation. Like literary criticism, anthropological interpretation involves unpacking layers of meaning yang inform cultural practices.

4.4.2 Thick Description dan Interpretive Method

Geertz adopts Ryle's concept of thick description sebagai methodological principle untuk anthropological analysis. Thick description goes beyond recording behavioral facts untuk interpret symbolic meanings yang inform cultural action.

Methodological steps dalam thick description :

1. **Observation**: Recording of cultural practices dan behaviors
2. **Participation**: Engagement dengan cultural actors untuk understand their perspectives
3. **Interpretation**: Analysis of symbolic meanings yang inform practices
4. **Translation**: Communication of cultural understanding kepada outside audience

Thick description requires attention kepada context, layers of meaning, dan interpretive frameworks yang cultural actors use untuk make sense of their actions.

Anthropologist must reconstruct native interpretations while maintaining critical distance dari those interpretations.

Example adalah Geertz's analysis of Balinese cockfight, yang on surface appears sebagai gambling event tetapi actually involves complex symbolic drama about status, masculinity, dan social hierarchy. Thick description reveals how cockfight serves sebagai text yang Balinese men read untuk understand themselves dan their society.

4.4.3 Symbols dan Symbolic Action

Geertz defines symbols as "any object, act, event, quality, or relation that serves as a vehicle for conception—conception is symbol's 'meaning'" (*Interpretation of Cultures*, p. 91).

Symbols operate dalam two ways:

- **Models of Reality**: Symbols represent existing social relations dan cultural categories
- **Models for Reality**: Symbols provide templates untuk organizing experience dan guiding action

Religious symbols, for example, simultaneously describe cosmic order (model of) dan prescribe ethical behavior (model for). Sacred symbols make cosmological beliefs seem factually accurate while making ethical prescriptions seem practically reasonable.

Symbolic action involves manipulation of symbols untuk communicate meanings, construct identity, negotiate relationships, dan interpret experience. Symbolic action is neither pure expression of internal states nor simple response kepada external stimuli, tetapi creative process of meaning-making yang draws on cultural resources.

4.4.4 Cultural System dan Social System

Geertz membedakan antara cultural system (organized totality of symbols dan meanings) dan social system (organized totality of social relationships dan institutions). Cultural system provides meaningful framework untuk social action, while social system provides institutional context untuk cultural expression.

Cultural system dan social system are analytically distinct tetapi empirically interpenetrated. Cultural meanings inform social action, while social relationships shape cultural meanings. Neither system determines the other, but they exist dalam dialectical relationship of mutual influence.

Example adalah relationship antara religious beliefs (cultural system) dan church organization (social system). Religious symbols provide meaningful framework untuk church activities, while church structure shapes interpretation dan transmission of religious symbols.

4.5 Maurice Merleau-Ponty: Embodied Culture dan Perceptual Meaning.

4.5.1 Phenomenology of Perception dan Cultural Embodiment.

Merleau-Ponty menunjukkan bahwa cultural meaning cannot be separated dari embodied experience of world. Perception is not passive reception of sensory data tetapi active engagement dengan meaningful environment yang already culturally structured.

"My body adalah my general medium for having world. Sometimes it is restricted kepada actions necessary untuk conservation of life, dan accordingly it posits around me biological world; sometimes, elaborating upon these primary actions dan moving dari their literal kepada figurative meaning, it manifests through them core of new significance" (Phenomenology of Perception, hal. 169).

Cultural objects—tools, artworks, architectural spaces—are meaningful karena they invite specific forms of bodily engagement. Hammer is understood sebagai hammering, chair sebagai sitting, door sebagai passing through. Cultural meaning is not added onto physical objects tetapi embedded dalam their perceptual structure.

Cultural learning involves acquisition of new forms of bodily competence rather than abstract knowledge. Learning untuk play musical instrument involves developing embodied skills yang become automatic, creating new possibilities untuk musical expression dan appreciation.

4.5.2 Gestural Meaning dan Expression

Merleau-Ponty menganalisis gesture sebagai primary form of cultural expression yang precedes dan grounds linguistic communication. Gestural meaning is neither purely physical movement nor pure mental intention, tetapi embodied significance yang emerges dalam interaction.

"Gesture does not make me think of anger—it is anger itself" (*Phenomenology of Perception*, hal. 214).

Cultural gestures—greetings, rituals, dances—carry meanings yang cannot be reduced kepada conventional symbols. Gestural meaning is lived meaning yang involves whole person dalam relationship dengan others dan environment.

Language itself is form of gestural behavior yang involves vocal gestures dan their responses. Linguistic meaning emerges dari embodied interaction rather than abstract symbolic manipulation. Speaking involves bodily skills of articulation, listening, dan response yang are culturally specific.

4.5.3 Style dan Cultural Expression

Merleau-Ponty mengembangkan concept of style sebagai coherent way of expressing meaning yang characterizes individual artists, cultural periods, atau cultural groups. Style is neither pure subjective expression nor objective formal property, tetapi emergent pattern yang arises dari repeated engagement dengan expressive possibilities.

"Style is a deviation, calculated or not, from accepted forms... it makes possible common world" (*Signs*, p. 55).

Artistic style involves development of personal way of engaging dengan expressive medium yang creates new possibilities untuk meaning. Cézanne's painting style, for example, tidak simply represents pre-existing visual experience tetapi creates new ways of seeing yang become available untuk others.

Cultural style involves characteristic ways of organizing experience, expressing meaning, dan engaging dengan world yang distinguish different cultural groups. Cultural style is not superficial decoration but fundamental orientation that shapes perception dan action.

4.6 Raymond Williams: Culture sebagai Whole Way of Life

4.6.1 Cultural Materialism dan Lived Experience

Williams mengembangkan approach kepada cultural analysis yang he calls "cultural materialism"—method yang examines cultural practices dalam their material context tanpa reducing culture kepada mere reflection of economic base.

"A culture has two aspects: known meanings dan directions, yang its members are trained to; creative responses kepada new conditions. These are social facts" (*Long Revolution*, hal. 57).

Cultural materialism treats culture sebagai material practice rather than ideal superstructure. Cultural production involves real labor, uses material resources, dan creates material products. Writing, performing, broadcasting are forms of work yang occur under specific social conditions dan relationships.

Williams emphasizes "structure of feeling"—lived culture of particular time dan place yang is not yet fully articulated tetapi is emerging dalam cultural practices. Structure of feeling captures cultural change dalam process, before it becomes formalized dalam dominant institutions.

4.6.2 Hegemony dan Counter-Hegemonic Culture

Williams adopts Gramsci's concept of hegemony untuk analyze cultural domination, but emphasizes dynamic character of hegemonic processes. Hegemony is not static ideological control tetapi active process of cultural leadership yang must constantly reproduce itself dalam face of alternative possibilities.

Dominant Culture: Culture yang corresponds kepada interests of dominant social groups dan is institutionally supported. Dominant culture appears universal dan natural rather than particular dan constructed.

Residual Culture: Elements of past culture yang remain active dalam present but are marginalized oleh dominant culture. Folk traditions, religious practices, craft skills may persist sebagai residual elements.

Emergent Culture: New cultural formations yang represent alternative possibilities tidak yet incorporated into dominant culture. Avant-garde movements, subcultural practices, oppositional politics may represent emergent culture.

Cultural struggle involves competition antara these different cultural formations. Dominant culture attempts untuk incorporate threatening elements while marginalizing atau suppressing genuinely oppositional alternatives.

4.6.3 Cultural Production dan Institutions

Williams analyzes cultural production sebagai social process yang involves complex relationships antara individual creativity, cultural institutions, dan social conditions. Cultural production cannot be reduced kepada individual expression atau institutional determination, but involves dialectical interaction.

Means of Cultural Production: Material resources required untuk cultural production—printing presses, theaters, broadcasting equipment, educational institutions. Control of cultural means affects what can be produced dan distributed.

Cultural Institutions: Organizations yang mediate antara cultural producers dan audiences—publishing houses, galleries, universities, media companies. Cultural institutions have selective functions yang determine what culture is transmitted.

Cultural Formation: Social groups organized around cultural practices—artistic movements, intellectual schools, popular cultural communities. Cultural formations provide contexts untuk cultural production dan reception.

Analysis of cultural institutions reveals how cultural value is socially constructed rather than inherent dalam cultural objects. Literary canon, artistic reputation, cultural taste are products of institutional processes rather than natural aesthetic judgments.

4.7 Case Study: Cultural Dynamics in a Contemporary Context

4.7.1 The Case of the Indonesian Education System: Cultural Capital and Social Reproduction

Indonesia's education system provides a paradigmatic example of how cultural capital operates as a mechanism of social reproduction in a postcolonial context.

Colonial Legacy dan Cultural Hierarchy: Warisan kolonial Belanda mengestablish hierarchy antara "high culture" (Western education, Dutch language, European arts) dan "native culture" (traditional practices, local languages, indigenous arts). Post-independence, hierarchy ini transformed tetapi tidak eliminated—English dan Western knowledge menggantikan Dutch sebagai markers of cultural distinction.

Language Capital: Proficiency in formal Indonesian and English serves as a crucial form of cultural capital. Middle-class families invest heavily in English education, creating advantages in university admissions and professional opportunities. Regional languages and colloquial Indonesian are devalued in an educational context.

Educational Credentialing: University degrees dari prestigious institutions (UI, ITB, UGM) function sebagai institutionalized cultural capital yang provides access kepada professional positions dan social networks. Private universities dengan international accreditation increasingly serve sebagai alternative pathway untuk cultural capital acquisition.

Cultural Violence dalam Curriculum: Standard curriculum privilegia urban, middle-class cultural references while marginalizing rural, working-class, dan ethnic minority cultures. Literature courses focus on national canon yang reflects dominant cultural

values. Traditional arts are relegated kepada "local content" subjects yang carry less prestige.

Symbolic Domination melalui Meritocracy: Educational system presents itself sebagai meritocratic competition yang rewards talent dan effort. However, success largely depends on possession of cultural capital dari family background. Students dari working-class families internalize responsibility untuk their educational failure, not recognizing structural disadvantages.

4.7.2 The Case of the K-Pop Cultural Industry: Global Cultural Flows and Soft Power

Korean Popular Culture (K-Pop) phenomenon menyediakan compelling example dari how cultural production operates dalam global context dan challenges traditional center-periphery models of cultural flow.

Cultural Hybridization: K-Pop combines Korean traditional elements (language, aesthetic sensibilities) dengan global popular culture forms (hip-hop, R&B, electronic dance music). This hybridization creates distinctive cultural product yang both local dan global dalam appeal.

Industrial Cultural Production: K-Pop industry represents highly rationalized form of cultural production yang combines creativity dengan systematic training, marketing, dan distribution. Idol trainees undergo years of cultural cultivation yang transforms them into cultural products with specific aesthetic dan performative qualities.

Embodied Cultural Performance: K-Pop performance involves sophisticated integration of music, dance, visual aesthetics, dan narrative construction. Performers embody cultural meanings yang resonate dengan diverse global audiences while maintaining distinctively Korean characteristics.

Digital Cultural Distribution: Social media platforms enable direct access kepada global audiences, bypassing traditional gatekeeping institutions. Fan communities become active participants dalam cultural production melalui content creation, translation, dan promotional activities.

Soft Power dan Cultural Influence: K-Pop success translates into broader cultural influence yang affects language learning (Korean), tourism (Hallyu wave), consumer preferences (Korean beauty products, food), dan even political attitudes toward Korea.

Cultural Resistance dan Appropriation: K-Pop's global success generates debates tentang cultural appropriation, authenticity, dan resistance kepada Western cultural

hegemony. Some view K-Pop sebagai alternative kepada American cultural dominance, while others see it sebagai replication of same commercial logic.

4.7.3 The Case of Indonesian Islamic Fashion: Religious Culture and Market Economy

The Islamic fashion industry in Indonesia reveals the complex relationship between religious cultural values and the market economy that challenges simple oppositions between sacred and secular, traditional and modern.

Religious Cultural Capital: Knowledge of Islamic principles regarding modest dress (aurat) constitutes form of cultural capital yang enables participation dalam Islamic fashion market. Understanding of religious requirements combined dengan aesthetic sensibility creates competitive advantage.

Embodied Religious Practice: Wearing hijab atau modest dress is not simply symbolic statement tetapi embodied religious practice yang involves daily negotiation antara religious obligations, personal identity, dan social expectations. Fashion choices become ways of expressing religious commitment while maintaining individual style.

Cultural Innovation dalam Religious Framework: Indonesian Islamic fashion designers create innovative designs yang comply dengan religious requirements while appealing kepada contemporary aesthetic sensibilities. This requires creative interpretation of religious principles dalam response kepada changing cultural conditions.

Global-Local Cultural Dynamics: Indonesian Islamic fashion draws inspiration from global fashion trends (Paris, Milan, Tokyo) while adapting them to local religious and cultural contexts. International Islamic fashion weeks create global networks for Islamic fashion culture.

Economic Conversion of Religious Culture: Religious cultural practices become basis untuk economic activity through Islamic fashion industry. Religious requirements create market demand yang can be profitably supplied. Cultural authenticity becomes marketing advantage.

Cultural Resistance kepada Western Secularism: Islamic fashion represents form of cultural resistance kepada assumption bahwa modernity requires secularization. Muslim women create modern identities yang integrate religious commitment dengan contemporary lifestyle.

4.8 Contemporary Theoretical Developments

4.8.1 Digital Culture dan Virtual Embodiment

Digital technologies create new forms of cultural experience yang challenge traditional boundaries antara material dan symbolic, embodied dan disembodied experience.

Virtual Reality dan Embodied Presence: VR technologies create immersive cultural experiences yang involve bodily engagement dengan virtual environments. Users develop new forms of embodied competence untuk navigating virtual spaces dan interacting dengan digital objects.

Social Media dan Cultural Performance: Digital platforms enable new forms of cultural performance dan identity construction. Users curate online personas melalui careful selection of images, texts, dan cultural references. Cultural capital can be displayed dan accumulated melalui social media engagement.

Algorithmic Curation dan Cultural Taste: Recommendation algorithms shape cultural consumption dengan filtering content based on user behavior patterns. Algorithmic curation may reinforce existing cultural preferences atau introduce users kepada new cultural possibilities.

4.8.2 Postcolonial Cultural Theory

Postcolonial theorists examine how colonial cultural hierarchies persist dalam postcolonial contexts dan develop strategies untuk cultural decolonization.

Cultural Hybridity: Postcolonial cultures are characterized oleh hybridity—creative mixing of indigenous dan colonial cultural elements. Hybridity is not simple synthesis tetapi creative tension yang generates new cultural possibilities.

Subaltern Cultural Voices: Postcolonial theory seeks untuk recover cultural voices yang have been marginalized atau suppressed oleh colonial cultural domination. This involves development of alternative cultural institutions dan platforms.

Epistemic Decolonization: Cultural decolonization requires challenging Western epistemological assumptions dan developing indigenous knowledge systems. This involves recognition bahwa different cultures have different ways of knowing dan valuing.

4.8.3 Environmental Cultural Studies

Environmental cultural studies examine relationship antara cultural practices dan ecological sustainability, challenging anthropocentric assumptions dalam cultural theory.

Cultural Ecology: Cultural practices are analyzed dalam their ecological context, examining how cultural meanings shape environmental relationships dan how environmental conditions influence cultural development.

Indigenous Cultural Knowledge: Indigenous cultures often embody sophisticated ecological knowledge yang has been developed over generations. This knowledge represents alternative kepada Western scientific approaches kepada environmental management.

Anthropocene Culture: Contemporary culture must grapple dengan reality bahwa human cultural activities have transformed global ecological systems. This requires development of new cultural narratives dan practices yang acknowledge human responsibility untuk planetary wellbeing.

4.9 Implications for Contemporary Cultural Philosophy

4.9.1 Beyond Idealism-Materialism Dichotomy

Analysis of cultural structure reveals that cultural phenomena cannot be understood through reduction to either ideal meanings or material conditions. Culture involves irreducible interpenetration of symbolic and material dimensions that requires non-reductive theoretical approaches.

Cultural meanings are not pure mental phenomena but are embodied dalam practices, institutions, dan objects. Cultural practices are not merely instrumental activities but are meaningful actions yang express dan reproduce cultural values. Cultural objects are not simple material things but are meaning-bearing entities yang invite specific forms of engagement.

4.9.2 Embodied Cultural Cognition

Research dalam cognitive science supports phenomenological insights tentang embodied character dari cultural cognition. Cultural understanding involves not just abstract knowledge but embodied skills, perceptual abilities, dan practical competences.

Cultural learning involves development of embodied dispositions yang enable participation dalam cultural practices. Musical training, for example, involves development of embodied skills yang enable musical expression dan appreciation. Linguistic competence involves embodied abilities untuk producing dan recognizing linguistic sounds, gestures, dan rhythms.

4.9.3 Cultural Democratization dan Digital Technologies

Digital technologies create new possibilities untuk cultural democratization dengan lowering barriers kepada cultural production dan distribution. However, digital cultural participation also requires new forms of cultural capital (digital literacy, technological access) yang may reproduce existing inequalities dalam new forms.

Digital platforms enable marginalized cultural voices untuk reach global audiences, but algorithmic systems may reinforce dominant cultural preferences. Cultural democratization requires attention kepada both technological possibilities dan structural constraints yang shape cultural participation.

4.9.4 Intercultural Understanding dalam Global Context

Globalization creates increased contact antara different cultural systems yang requires development of intercultural competences for meaningful communication dan cooperation. This involves not just knowledge about other cultures but embodied abilities untuk participating dalam intercultural interactions.

Intercultural understanding requires recognition bahwa different cultures have different ways of organizing experience, expressing meaning, dan valuing activities. This challenges universalistic assumptions while maintaining possibilities untuk intercultural dialogue dan cooperation.

4.10 Conclusion: Towards Post-Dualistic Cultural Theory

Analysis of cultural structure reveals the fundamental inadequacy of dualistic frameworks for understanding cultural reality. Cultural phenomena cannot be understood through simple oppositions between meaning and matter, symbol and substance, interpretation and explanation, or idealism and materialism.

Key insights that emerge from this analysis:

1. **Embodied Cultural Meaning**: Cultural meanings are not abstract mental phenomena but are embodied dalam practices, objects, dan experiences yang involve whole persons dalam engagement dengan meaningful environments.
2. **Cultural Capital as Hybrid Power**: Cultural capital operates as a form of power that is simultaneously symbolic and material, challenging conventional distinctions between economic and cultural spheres.
3. **Interpretive Complexity**: Cultural analysis requires interpretive methods yang can grasp multiple layers of meaning tanpa reducing cultural phenomena kepada simple causal explanations atau pure hermeneutic understanding.
4. **Cultural Struggle dan Reproduction**: Cultural processes involve ongoing struggles untuk definition, valuation, dan transmission of cultural meanings yang connect kepada broader patterns of social reproduction dan transformation.
5. **Global-Local Cultural Dynamics**: Contemporary cultural phenomena involve complex interactions antara global flows dan local specificities yang transcend simple center-periphery models.
6. **Digital Cultural Transformation**: Digital technologies create new forms of cultural experience, production, dan distribution yang require theoretical frameworks capable of addressing virtual embodiment dan algorithmic mediation.

Analysis ini provides foundation untuk development of post-dualistic cultural theory yang dapat address complexity of contemporary cultural reality while maintaining critical awareness of power relations dan possibilities untuk cultural transformation. Such theory must be capable of integrating insights dari interpretive anthropology, cultural sociology, phenomenology, dan postcolonial studies tanpa reducing cultural phenomena kepada any single theoretical framework.

CHAPTER 5.

CHAPTER 5: TEMPORAL STRUCTURE: TOWARDS AN INTEGRATIVE UNDERSTANDING OF TIME, MEMORY, AND SOCIAL ACTION.

And socio-ideological possibility: "God must be playing dice" - a treatise on efforts to reconstruct the sociological dimension to the clarification of confrontational conflicts.

The question of time has been one of the fundamental concerns in the tradition of philosophical and sociological thought since the classical era. However, conventional understandings of temporality are often caught up in reductionism that artificially separates the subjective and objective dimensions of temporal experience. In the contemporary sociological context, the urgency to develop a more comprehensive understanding of temporal structures is becoming increasingly urgent, especially in the face of the complexity of social phenomena characterized by the dynamics of confrontational conflicts between groups that are often rooted in differences in temporal and historical perceptions.

Henri Bergson, Maurice Halbwachs, and Anthony Giddens—the three thinkers who will be the focus of this chapter's analysis—offer complementary perspectives in an effort to transcend the reductive dichotomy. Bergson with his *concept of durée* criticizes the dominant spatialization of time in dualistic thought; Halbwachs uncovers the social dimension of memory showing how individual temporality has always been structured within a collective framework; while Giddens integrated the diachronic and synchronous dimensions in his structuring theory. These three approaches, when synthesized, open up the possibility of understanding how temporal structures not only shape individual experience, but also become a terrain of ideological contestation that can generate social conflicts.

Etymology and Terminological Context

Duration: Time as a Vital Stream

The concept *of durée* developed by Bergson comes from the French word which literally means "duration" or "length of time." However, in the Bergsonian philosophical context, *durée* refers to temporal experiences that are living, qualitative, and cannot be reduced to spatial measures. The etymology of this word can be traced to the Latin *durare* meaning "to endure" or "to continue," which implies dynamic continuity rather than static segmentation.

For Bergson, *durée* is fundamentally different from *temps* (mechanical time) measured by clocks and calendars. If mechanical time is homogeneous and mathematically divisible, then *durée* is heterogeneous, indivisible, and always involves the interpenetration between the past, present, and future. In the experience *of durée*, each moment does not stand alone but is always related to the totality of the temporal experience that precedes it.

Bergson's critique of the spatialization of time targets a tradition of thought that treats time as the fourth dimension of space, in which the past, present, and future are understood as distinct locations in a linear timeline. This approach, according to Bergson, fails to capture the dynamic and creative nature of true temporality that always involves novelty and qualitative change.

Social Frameworks of Memory: Memory as a Collective Construction

Maurice Halbwachs developed the concept *of cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (the social framework of memory) to explain how the process of remembering is always mediated by social structures. The term "social framework" (*cadres sociaux*) refers to a collective system of reference—such as language, institutions, traditions, and social practices—that provide context and meaning to individual memory.

The etymology of the word *cadre* comes from the Latin *quadrum* meaning "frame" or "skeleton," indicating its function as a limiting structure while allowing the articulation of memory. Halbwachs points out that no memory is truly individual or purely subjective; Every act of remembering always involves reference to a collectively shared system of meaning.

The concept *of collective temporality* developed by Halbwachs suggests that each social group has a distinctive temporal rhythm, which is shaped by a shared cycle of activities, rituals, celebrations, and historical narratives. This collective

temporality not only provides a framework for organizing the experience of time, but also serves as the basis for group identity and social solidarity.

Structuration Theory: Integration of Temporal Dimensions

Anthony Giddens developed *structuration theory* as an attempt to overcome the dualism of structure-agency in sociology. In this theory, the temporal dimension plays a central role through the integration between diachronic (changes over time) and synchronous (simultaneous relationships within a given time) aspect.

Giddens' chosen term of "*structuration*" emphasizes processes rather than static entities. Different from "structure" which implies a fixed configuration, "structuring" refers to the continuous process by which structures are produced and reproduced through social practices. The temporal dimension is fundamental because every social action always involves mobilizing resources from the past (memory, knowledge, rules) to deal with present situations and anticipate future consequences.

The concept *of diachronic* is derived from the Greek *dia*(through) and *chronos* (time), referring to an analysis that emphasizes changes and developments over time. While *synchronic* of *syn* (together) and *chronos*, emphasizes relationships that occur at the same time. Giddens shows that these two dimensions are inseparable in social analysis; Each synchronous moment is always related to a broader diachronic process.

Substantive Context and Conceptual Priorities

Criticism of Temporal Reductionism

These three thinkers are united in criticizing reductionism that reduces temporal complexity to overly simplified schemes. Bergson criticized the reduction of time to space; Halbwachs criticized the reduction of social memory to individual psychology; Giddens criticized the reduction of social dynamics to static structures or atomistic actions.

A conceptual priority that emerges is the need to understand temporality as an active and constitutive medium for social reality, not just the dimension in which social events occur. Time is not an empty container filled by events, but a dimension that forms the fundamental character of social experience and action.

Integration of Subjectivity and Objectivity

These three thinkers' approach offers a way to integrate the subjective and objective dimensions of temporality without reducing either of them. Bergsonian's Durée shows how the subjective experience of time has an irreducible reality; Halbwachs' social framework of memory shows how subjectivity has always been socially structured; Giddens' structuring theory shows how subjectivity and objectivity are mutually produced in social processes.

Case Example: Temporal Conflict in Contemporary Society

Case 1: Generational Conflict in the Digital Age

In the context of a contemporary digital society, we can observe the concrete manifestations of the battles between different temporal frameworks. The generation that grew up in the pre-digital era had *a durée* structured by a more linear and sequential rhythm, while the digital native generation experienced a more fragmentary and multi-tasking temporality.

Conflict arises when these two temporal frameworks interact in social institutions such as family, school, or workplace. Older generations often interpret the temporal patterns of the younger generation as a lack of focus or discipline, while younger generations experience the more conventional temporal framework as rigid and unresponsive to contemporary dynamics.

In Halbwachs' perspective, we can see how each generation has different *social frameworks of memory*, which shape the way they organize temporal experiences. Social media, for example, creates a framework of collective memory that is very different from the framework formed by conventional media.

Case 2: Post-Conflict Reconciliation and the Politics of Memory

In the context of post-conflict reconciliation, the fight over historical narratives is often an intense arena of contestation. Each group involved in the conflict has a different *collective temporality*, with an emphasis on different historical events, different causal interpretations, and different visions of the future.

For example, in the case of the 1998 post-reform reconciliation in Indonesia, different social groups have different memory frameworks about the New Order period. Some groups emphasize aspects of economic stability and development, while others emphasize the repressive aspects and human rights violations. These

differences in the framework of memory reflect not only differences in historical experience, but also differences in visions of the desired future.

In Giddens' perspective, the process of reconciliation can be understood as an attempt to create *a new structuration* that integrates the diachronic (recognition of historical complexity) and the synchronic (the creation of an institutional framework for coexistence in the present).

Case 3: Globalization and Temporal Dislocation

The process of globalization creates a phenomenon that can be referred to as "temporal dislocation," in which local communities have to deal with temporal rhythms imposed from the outside. The global economic system, for example, requires adaptation to market cycles that are not in tune with traditional temporal rhythms.

In the context of an agrarian society that must integrate with the global economy, we can observe how *the durée* structured by the cycles of seasons and agriculture clashes with the linear and mechanical temporality of the industrial production system. This conflict is not only economic but also existential, because it concerns the fundamental way in which society experiences and interprets time.

Ideological Implications: "God Must Be Playing Dice"

The phrase "God Must Be Playing Dice" that is the sub-title of this analysis refers to the opposite of Einstein's statement that "God does not play dice with the universe." If Einstein rejected quantum indeterminism in favor of cosmic determinism, then in the sociological context of temporality, we are facing a paradoxical situation: while temporal structures provide a framework for predictability and social continuity, at the same time they also open up space for contingencies, creativity, and completely unpredictable change.

In Bergsonian's perspective, *durée* always involves an element of novelty that cannot be fully anticipated. In Halbwachs' perspective, changes in the social framework of memory can result in a reinterpretation of the past that alters the trajectory of the future. In Giddens' perspective, the structuring process is always open to unintended consequences that can change the structure itself.

The ideological dimension arises when various social groups seek to claim authority in defining a legitimate temporal framework. Confrontational conflicts often involve fights over who has the right to determine the dominant historical narrative, the temporal rhythms to follow, and the vision of the future to be fought for.

"Playing craps" in this context refers to the fact that although social actors seek to control and predict the outcome of their actions, the temporal dimension of social reality always contains an element of uncertainty that cannot be completely eliminated. Paradoxically, it is precisely through the recognition of this uncertainty that the possibility for dialogue and reconciliation can be opened.

The reconstruction of the sociological dimensions proposed in this analysis aims to develop an understanding of temporal structures that can accommodate both the need for continuity and stability and the need for change and transformation. Clarification of confrontational conflicts requires the recognition that every social group has a legitimate temporal framework, and that the task of sociology is to facilitate dialogue between those frameworks rather than to impose the hegemony of one framework over another.

Thus, temporal structure becomes not only an object of sociological analysis, but also a medium through which emancipatory possibilities can be articulated. A more sophisticated understanding of the temporal dimensions of social reality could pave the way for more inclusive forms of social organization that are responsive to the complexity of diverse temporal experiences in contemporary societies.

CHAPTER 6.

CHAPTER 6: SPATIAL STRUCTURE: SPATIAL PRODUCTION, POWER GEOGRAPHY, AND SPATIO-TEMPORAL DIALECTICS IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL FORMATIONS.

Space, in the tradition of classical sociological thought, is often reduced to a passive container in which social activity takes place—an empty stage waiting to be filled by social actors and events. This spatial reductionism not only fails to grasp the complexity of socio-spatial dynamics, but it also obscures the fundamental ways in which space is produced, contested, and transformed through social practices. In the

context of neoliberal globalization and massive urbanization that mark the contemporary era, the urgency to develop a critical understanding of spatial structure is becoming increasingly urgent, especially in understanding how confrontational conflicts between groups are often mediated through contestations over control and meaning of space.

Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and David Harvey—the three thinkers who will be the focus of analysis in this chapter—offer a complementary theoretical framework for understanding the complexity of the production of social space. Lefebvre with his dialectical triad of space production reveals how spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces interact in socio-spatial formations; Foucault shows how space and knowledge constitute each other in disciplinary mechanisms; while Harvey analyzes how spatial fixes in capitalization function to overcome systemic contradictions through geographic expansion and temporal displacement. These three approaches, when synthesized, open up the possibility of understanding how spatial structures not only shape social relations, but also become a terrain of ideological contestation that can generate or defuse social conflicts.

Etymology and Terminological Context

Production of Space: Space as a Social Product

Henri Lefebvre's *concept of production of space* revolutionized the conventional understanding of space by showing that space is not a given or natural entity, but rather a product of complex and contradictory social practices. The term "*production*" here does not refer to the manufacturing of physical objects, but to the social processes that produce space as a living and meaningful reality.

The etymology of the word "production" comes from the Latin *producere*, which consists of *pro* (forward) and *ducere* (leading/carrying), implying the process of bringing something into existence. In the Lefebvrean context, the production of space involves three interrelated dialectical moments:

1. **Spatial Practice** (*pratique spatiale*) refers to the production and reproduction of space through everyday material activities. It encompasses patterns of movement, routine, and space use that create social cohesion through shared spatial experiences. Spatial practices are the most concrete and observable dimensions, encompassing the way people move through cities, use transportation, work, and rest.
2. **Representations of Space** (*représentations de l'espace*) are conceptualized spaces—spaces of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocrats, and social engineers. It is the dominant space in a given society, a space that is codified

through a system of signs, maps, blueprints, and regulations. The representation of space tends to be abstract and instrumental, seeking to regulate and control the use of space.

3. **Representational Spaces** (*espaces de représentation*) are spaces that live through complex images and symbols, spaces of occupants and users, but also artists, writers and philosophers. It is a space that is passively experienced, a space that the imagination seeks to transform and capture. Representational space is the most symbolically and emotionally rich dimension.

Disciplinary Mechanisms: Space as a Technology of Power

Michel Foucault developed an analysis of how space functions as a technology of power in modern disciplinary mechanisms. The concept of *disciplinary mechanisms* refers to the techniques of power that operate not through direct repression, but through the production of docile and productive subjectivity.

The term "discipline" has a complex etymology from the Latin *disciplina*, which comes from *discipulus* (disciple) and *discere* (learn). However, in the Foucauldian context, discipline does not only refer to the process of learning, but to the technology of power that produces truth and subjectivity simultaneously.

Foucault shows how institutional architecture—prisons, hospitals, schools, factories—is not neutral but is a materialization of a strategy of power. Bentham's panopticon is a metaphor for explaining how visibility and invisibility are spatially organized to produce disciplinary effects. In a panoptic structure, the subject becomes an object of knowledge through a spatial organization that allows for constant surveillance.

Foucault's *concept of the space-knowledge nexus* suggests that space and knowledge are inseparable; each knowledge regime has a specific spatiality, and each spatial organization implies a particular mode of knowledge. Modern hospitals, for example, not only organize space for medical efficiency, but also produce the body as objects of medical knowledge.

Spatial Fix: The Geographization of Capital Contradictions

David Harvey developed the concept *of spatial fix* to explain how capitalism overcomes its internal crises and contradictions through geographic reorganization. The term "fix" has a double meaning in English: as "fix" (*to fix something*) and as "fixation" or "temporary stabilization" (*a temporary fix*).

The etymology of "spatial" comes from the Latin *spatium* meaning "space" or "distance," while "fix" comes from the Latin *fixus* (fixed, immovable). However, the paradox of the spatial fix is that it achieves stabilization through mobility—through geographic expansion and constant spatial reorganization.

Harvey identifies two main dimensions of spatial fix:

1. **Geographical Expansion** refers to the horizontal expansion of capital into new territories to find profitable markets, resources, and investment opportunities. This expansion is not only physical but also involves the integration of new territories into the circuits of capital through infrastructure, technology, and institutions.
2. **Temporal Displacement** refers to the transfer of crises from the present to the future through investment in built environments and infrastructure that have a long duration. This investment absorbs surplus capital in the short term but creates fixed capital that must remain productive in the long term.

The concept *of contradictions of capitalism* that underlies Harvey's analysis refers to the internal dynamics of the capitalist system that produce periodic crises. The fundamental contradiction between use-value and exchange-value, between labor and capital, between production and consumption, creates pressures that must be managed through spatio-temporal reorganization.

Substantive Context and Conceptual Priorities

Criticism of Spatial Absolutism

These three thinkers are united in criticizing the absolutist conception of space that treats space as a neutral and homogeneous container. Lefebvre criticizes the abstract space that dominates capitalist modernity; Foucault criticized the assumptions of transparency and neutrality of space in social analysis; Harvey criticized spatial fetishism that obscures social relations that materialize in geographical formations.

The conceptual priority that emerges is the need to understand space as an active and constitutive medium for social relations. Space is not only the location where social activity occurs, but the dimension that forms the fundamental character of those relationships. Each social relation has a specific spatiality, and each spatial formation expresses a specific social relation.

Dialectic Spasio-Temporal

These three approaches also emphasize the importance of understanding the dialectic between spatial and temporal dimensions in social formations. Space is not static but is always in the process of becoming; Time is not abstract but always spatialized. Lefebvre shows how the production of space involves complex temporalities; Foucault analyzes how the genealogy of power materializes in spatial formations; Harvey shows how temporal displacement and geographical expansion are interrelated in spatial fixes.

The Politicization of Spatiality

Another fundamental similarity is the emphasis on the political dimension of spatiality. Space is not neutral but always a stake in the contest of power. Lefebvre developed the concept of "right to the city" as a political demand for democratic access to urban space; Foucault analyzes how spatial control becomes fundamental in the technology of governmentality; Harvey shows how uneven geographical development is a product of class dynamics in capitalism.

Case Example: Spatial Contestation in Contemporary Social Formations

Kasus 1: Gentrification dan Right to the City

The phenomenon of gentrification in contemporary global cities provides a concrete illustration of how the three dimensions of Lefebvre's spatial production operate in the context of urban space capitalization. Gentrification involves complex transformations in spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces.

In the dimension **of spatial practice**, gentrification changes the pattern of daily activities in a particular neighborhood. The arrival of new residents with higher incomes changes the rhythm of space use—business operating hours change, the dominant type of transportation changes, and pedestrian movement patterns change. Coffee shops replace traditional stalls, bike lanes replace parking areas, and co-working spaces replace traditional workshops.

In the dimension **of representations of space**, gentrification is preceded and facilitated by the production of technical knowledge about the area. Urban planners categorize areas as "underutilized" or "blighted," real estate developers produce market analyses that show the area's "potential," and local governments

develop zoning regulations that facilitate "revitalization." These representations are abstract and instrumental, obscuring the complexities of existing social life.

In the dimension **of representational spaces**, gentrification involves contesting the symbolic and emotional meaning of the area. For the old residents, the area may represent community, belonging, and historical continuity. For newcomers, the same area may represent opportunity, authenticity, and urban lifestyle. Gentrification conflicts are often conflicts between different ways of living and imagining space.

In Harvey's perspective, gentrification can be understood as a form of local spatial fix that addresses the profitability crisis in the real estate sector through geographic "upgrading." Surplus capital that cannot be invested productively in other sectors is diverted to the built environment through renovation, redevelopment, and property speculation.

Kasus 2: Smart City dan Surveillance Urbanism

The proliferative smart city initiatives of the past decade provide a contemporary example of how space and knowledge constitute each other in new forms of disciplinary mechanisms. Different from the classical panopticon that Foucault analyzed, smart cities operate surveillance through an ambient and ubiquitous digital infrastructure.

In a smart city, every aspect of urban life—traffic flow, energy consumption, waste production, air quality, human mobility—becomes an object of monitoring and optimization. Sensors embedded in infrastructure produce real-time data on urban conditions, while machine learning algorithms analyze the data to optimize the city's "efficiency" and sustainability.

However, as Foucauldian analysis shows, this production of knowledge is not neutral. Smart cities produce urban subjects as data points that can be monitored, predicted, and optimized. Citizens become "users" of urban services, and their activities become "behaviors" that can be modified through nudging and incentive structures.

Smart city spatiality also reconfigures the relationship between public and private space. Public spaces are being instrumented with technology that allows constant monitoring, while private spaces are becoming connected through the Internet of Things that integrates domestic life with urban management systems.

Resistance to surveillance urbanism often takes the form of spatial practices that seek to create spaces of invisibility and anonymity. These include tactical urbanism that uses temporary interventions to claim public space, digital detox

movements that reject smart city infrastructure, and privacy activism that demands transparency in the use of urban data.

Case 3: Extractive Industries and Environmental Injustice

The expansion of extractive industries—mining, oil drilling, deforestation—into peripheral regions provides an illustration of how the spatial fix operates on a global scale and results in deeply uneven geographical development. This case also shows how environmental injustice has a fundamental spatial dimension.

In Harvey's perspective, the expansion of extractive industries is a form of spatial fix that overcomes the crisis of overaccumulation in core economies through geographical expansion to the periphery. Surplus capital that cannot be profitably invested in manufacturing or services is diverted to the extraction of natural resources in areas that were not previously fully integrated in global capitalism.

However, this spatial fix creates new contradictions in the form of environmental degradation and social displacement in extractive sites. Communities that depend on subsistence agriculture or traditional livelihoods experience dispossession when their land is converted to mining or plantation. Environmental pollution changes the carrying capacity of local ecosystems, forcing out-migration and urbanization.

In Lefebvre's perspective, resistance to extractive industries often takes the form of assertion of alternative spatial practices and representational spaces. Indigenous communities, for example, claim territorial sovereignty based on cosmologies and practices that differ from capitalist property regimes. Environmental activists developed alternative maps and knowledge systems that show ecological connections that are overlooked by extractive capital.

In Foucault's perspective, the legitimacy of extractive industries depends on the production of scientific knowledge that categorizes certain spaces as "empty," "underdeveloped," or "underutilized." Geological surveys, environmental impact assessments, and economic feasibility studies produce representations of space that facilitate extraction while obscuring the social and ecological complexities of these territories.

Ideological Implications: Spatial Contestation and Sociological Reconstruction

Space as an Ideological Arena

The three perspectives analyzed in this chapter converge on the understanding that space is never neutral but always has a stake in ideological contestation. Each spatial formation expresses and reproduces a particular power relation, and each spatial transformation involves contesting different visions of how society should be organized.

In the context of "God Must Be Playing Dice," the spatial dimension adds complexity to the uncertainty inherent in social formations. While actors seek to control and predict spatial outcomes through planning, regulation, and investment, spatial processes always involve unintended consequences and contingent developments that cannot be fully anticipated.

Lefebvre shows that the production of space involves contradictions that cannot be resolved finally; Foucault shows that disciplinary mechanisms always produce resistances and counter-conducts; Harvey points out that spatial fixes are always temporary and create new contradictions that require further spatial reorganization.

Reconstruction of the Sociological Dimension

The reconstruction of the sociological dimensions proposed in this analysis aims to develop an understanding of spatial structures that can accommodate both spatial justice and spatial diversity. This requires the recognition that different groups have legitimate spatial needs and spatial imaginaries, and that the task of sociology is to facilitate democratic spatial negotiations rather than to impose spatial hegemony.

Lefebvre's concept of "right to the city" can be extended to a more general "right to space"—the right to participate in the production of space, to access meaningful spaces, and to resist unjust spatial impositions. However, the realization of the right to space requires simultaneous transformation in spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces.

Clarification of Confrontational Conflict

Confrontational conflicts in spatial contexts are often rooted in incompatible spatial practices, conflicting representations of space, or competing

representational spaces. Clarifying this kind of conflict requires spatial literacy that allows different groups to understand and negotiate spatial differences.

This includes the ability to read spatial arrangements as expressions of power relations, to imagine alternative spatial possibilities, and to engage in inclusive and sustainable spatial practices. Spatial literacy also includes an understanding of different scales—from body space to global space—and the connections between them.

In urban contexts, for example, conflicts over gentrification can be addressed through participatory planning processes that allow different groups to negotiate spatial changes. In the rural context, conflicts over land use can be addressed through co-management arrangements that integrate different knowledge systems and spatial practices.

Emansipatory Spatial Practices

The analysis of spatial structure also opens up possibilities for **emancipatory spatial practices. These include:**

- **Spatial Commons**: The creation of collectively managed and democratically accessible spaces, which resist both state control and market commodification.
- **Tactical Urbanism**: Temporary and small-scale interventions that claim public space and create alternative spatial experiences.
- **Digital Spatial Justice**: The use of digital technologies to democratize spatial information and facilitate participation in spatial planning.
- **Ecological Spatial Practices**: Spatial arrangements yang sustainable dan yang mengintegrasikan human activities dengan ecological processes.

Thus, spatial structure becomes not only an object of sociological analysis, but also a medium through which emancipatory possibilities can be articulated and realized. A more sophisticated understanding of the spatial dimensions of social reality can pave the way for more just, inclusive, and sustainable forms of spatial organization in contemporary society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources of Philosophy

Aristoteles. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Bergson, Henri. *Matter and Memory*. Translated by Nancy Margaret Paul and W. Scott Palmer. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1911.

Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Translated by F.L. Pogson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1910.

Cassirer, Ernst. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-1957.

Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. In *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Science of Logic*. Translated by A.V. Miller. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. Translated by W.R. Boyce Gibson. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1931.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. London: Macmillan, 1929.

Sociological Primary Sources

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Durkheim, Émile. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Translated by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Translated by Karen E. Fields. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from Cultural Writings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. 2 vols. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984-1987.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. Translated by Francis J. Ditter Jr. and Vida Yazdi Ditter. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

Harvey, David. *Social Justice and the City*. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. Translated by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

Lukács, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1971.

Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, vol. 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

Marx, Karl. *The German Ideology*. In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, vol. 5. New York: International Publishers, 1976.

Marx, Karl. *Capital*, vol. 1. Translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Secondary Sources and Contemporary Studies

Alexander, Jeffrey C. *Theoretical Logic in Sociology*. 4 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982-1983.

Archer, Margaret S. *Being Human: The Problem of Agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Bhaskar, Roy. *The Possibility of Naturalism*. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1979.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Callinicos, Alex. *Making History: Agency, Structure and Change in Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.

Chalmers, David. *The Conscious Mind*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Dennett, Daniel C. *Consciousness Explained*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1991.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory*. London: Macmillan, 1979.

Gilbert, Margaret. *On Social Facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits*. Translated by Bruce Fink. New York: Norton, 2006.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.

Nagel, Thomas. *Mind and Cosmos*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Searle, John R. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

CONCEPTUAL INDEX

A

- **Agency dan Structure**: 45, 67, 89, 123, 145
- **Alienation (Marx)**: 78, 92, 156, 234
- **Animal Symbolicum (Cassirer)**: 167, 189, 223

B

- **Being dan Time (Heidegger)**: 134, 178, 201
- **Bourdieu, Pierre - Habitus**: 23, 67, 89, 145, 178, 201, 234

C

- **Collective Consciousness (Durkheim)**: 45, 123, 167, 223
- **Commodity Fetishism**: 78, 156, 189
- **Cultural Capital**: 89, 145, 201, 234

D

- **Dialectical Method**: 34, 67, 123, 178
- **Dualism, Cartesian**: 12, 45, 78, 134, 167
- **Duration (Bergson):** 134, 201, 223

And

- **Economic Structure**: 78, 92, 156, 189
- **Embodiment**: 23, 67, 145, 201
- **Epistemological Break**: 45, 123, 178

F

- **False Consciousness**: 92, 156, 189, 234
- **Field Theory (Bourdieu)**: 89, 145, 201
- **Foucault - Power/Knowledge**: 178, 223, 267

G

- **Geertz - Thick Description**: 167, 189, 223

- **Gramsci - Hegemony**: 92, 156, 234, 267

H

- **Habermas - Communicative Action**: 123, 178, 234, 267
- **Halbwachs - Social Memory**: 134, 201, 223
- **Harvey - Spatial Fix**: 201, 223, 267

I

- **Ideal Types (Weber)**: 45, 123, 178
- **Ideology**: 92, 156, 189, 234
- **Intersubjectivity**: 123, 145, 178, 223

L

- **Lacan - Symbolic Order**: 167, 189, 223, 267
- **Lefebvre - Production of Space**: 201, 223, 267
- **Legitimation**: 92, 156, 234
- **Lévi-Strauss - Structural Anthropology**: 167, 189

M

- **Marx - Praxis**: 34, 78, 156, 234
- **Material Base dan Superstructure**: 78, 92, 156
- **Merleau-Ponty - Embodied Cognition**: 23, 67, 145

Or

- **Objectification**: 78, 156, 189, 234
- **Ontological Dualism**: 12, 45, 134, 167

P

- **Political Structure**: 92, 156, 234, 267
- **Postmodernity**: 223, 267, 289
- **Power Relations**: 156, 178, 234, 267

R

- **Rationality**: 45, 123, 178, 234

- **Reification (Lukács)**: 78, 156, 189
- **Res Cogitans dan Res Extensa**: 12, 45, 134

S

- **Social Construction**: 123, 145, 189, 223
- **Social Facts (Durkheim)**: 45, 123, 167
- **Structuration Theory**: 67, 145, 201
- **Symbolic Violence**: 89, 156, 234, 267

T

- **Temporal Structure**: 134, 201, 223
- **Theory of Recognition**: 123, 178, 234

In the

- **Unconscious Structures**: 167, 189, 223

V

- **Understanding (Weber):** 45, 123, 178

In

- **Weber - Ideal Types**: 45, 123, 178
- **World-System Theory**: 223, 267, 289

Note: The numbers in the index refer to hypothetical pages in the discussion structure that will be developed further.

In the context of a philosophical dualistic system, here are 6 fundamental problems related to theoretical conceptual conditions: